

Compact Nuclei in Galaxies at Moderate Redshift: I. Imaging and Spectroscopy¹

Vicki L. Sarajedini ²

Steward Observatory, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

Richard F. Green

NOAO³, P.O. Box 26732, Tucson, AZ 85726

Richard E. Griffiths and Kavan Ratnatunga

Carnegie Mellon University, Department of Physics, 5000 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh, PA
15213-3890

Received _____; accepted _____

¹Based on observations made with NASA/ESA *Hubble Space Telescope*, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under contract with NASA

²current address is UCO/Lick Observatory, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064

³The National Optical Astronomy Observatories are operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under Cooperative Agreement with the National Science Foundation.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the space density and properties of active galaxies to $z \simeq 0.8$. We have investigated the frequency and nature of unresolved nuclei in galaxies at moderate redshift as indicators of nuclear activity such as Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) or starbursts. Candidates are selected by fitting imaged galaxies with multi-component models using maximum likelihood estimate techniques to determine the best model fit. We select those galaxies requiring an unresolved, point source component in the galaxy nucleus, in addition to a disk and/or bulge component, to adequately model the galaxy light.

We have searched 70 WFPC2 images primarily from the Medium Deep Survey for galaxies containing compact nuclei. In our survey of 1033 galaxies, the fraction containing an unresolved nuclear component $\geq 3\%$ of the total galaxy light is $16 \pm 3\%$ corrected for incompleteness and $9 \pm 1\%$ for nuclei $\geq 5\%$ of the galaxy light. Spectroscopic redshifts have been obtained for 35 of our AGN/starburst candidates and photometric redshifts are estimated to an accuracy of $\sigma_z \simeq 0.1$ for the remaining sample. In this paper, the first of two for this study, we present the selected HST imaged galaxies having unresolved nuclei and discuss the selection procedure. We also present the ground-based spectroscopy for these galaxies as well as the photometric redshift predictions for those galaxies without spectra.

Subject headings: galaxies:active-nuclei-starburst

1. Introduction

Accurate knowledge of the luminosity function (LF) of active galactic nuclei over a wide range of absolute magnitudes is necessary to understand the nature and evolution of these objects. The behavior of the LF as a function of redshift especially at the faint end is crucial for understanding the manner in which AGN evolve. There are several models for quasar evolution which can be much better constrained with accurate knowledge of the shape at the faint end. Koo (1986) explains that many of the models are difficult to discriminate when only bright quasars are included. This is because the bright end LF shape is close to that of a power-law with a slope that is almost identical at all redshifts.

Additionally, AGN are likely contributors to the X-ray background and several studies have determined the contribution by bright quasars to the diffuse background (e.g. Schmidt & Green 1986). The overall contribution of low luminosity AGNs (LLAGNs) to the diffuse X-ray background has been a question of interest for some time (Elvis et al. 1984; Koratkar et al. 1995). An accurate understanding of the behavior of the faint AGN LF and its evolution would aid in addressing this question. Specifically, X-ray-to-optical flux ratios from the *Einstein Medium Sensitivity Survey* for AGNs (Stocke et al. 1991) allow for determination of the contribution of AGNs to the soft X-ray background based upon their optical intensity.

The faint end of the AGN LF ($M_B \geq -23$) has been determined locally using Seyfert galaxy nuclei which are considered to be the intrinsically fainter counterparts of more distant, brighter QSOs (Cheng et al. 1985; Huchra & Burg 1992). There have been many techniques employed to select Seyferts and other galaxies with unusual activity. Markarian et al. (1981) used the UV-excess technique to select galaxies containing a very blue continuum. The presence of emission lines (Salzer et al. 1989; 1995) has also been used as an indicator of galactic activity. These techniques typically find that ~5% to 10% of the

selected galaxies host AGNs.

It is difficult, however, to obtain a Seyfert sample which is free from biases. Seyferts selected by UV or X-ray excess are likely to favor type 1 nuclei. Selection based on IR properties is biased toward galaxies with high star formation rates. One of the most prevalent biases is toward nuclei which dominate the light of the host galaxy. Almost all Seyfert samples selected on the basis of spectroscopic properties of the nucleus have this selection effect. This is true for Seyferts selected on the basis of UV excess or the presence of emission lines. The Huchra & Burg (1992) Seyfert sample from the CfA redshift survey was obtained through spectroscopic selection of galaxies based on the presence of broad emission lines, indicative of Seyfert 1 activity, or emission line flux ratios indicating Seyfert 2 or LINER activity. The presence of such emission lines differentiates between a thermal and non-thermal energy source in the nucleus. Again, this selection technique requires that the nucleus dominate the galaxy light or have adequate spatial resolution for subtraction of the galaxy light from the nucleus. Maiolino & Rieke (1995) show that the nuclear luminosities of CfA Seyferts are closely related to the integrated galaxy luminosities indicating a bias towards brighter, nucleus dominated Seyferts. For this reason, the local AGN LF does not extend below $M_B \simeq -17.5$.

Likewise, little is currently known about how the faint end of the LF evolves. Even at modest redshifts, LLAGNs become virtually impossible to observe from the ground. In ground-based images the unresolved nuclei cannot be distinguished from central regions of enhanced star formation or finite central density cusps of spheroidal components. This problem, however, is greatly diminished by the Hubble Space Telescope’s unique high resolution imaging capabilities.

The Medium Deep Survey (MDS) (Griffiths et al. 1994) yielded 2 to 4 parallel WFPC2 exposures per week where reliable classification was possible for galaxies down to $V \sim 23.5$

mag. This survey provides an ideal sample of distant field galaxies for which morphology and galaxy light profiles can be studied for the first time at sub-kiloparsec resolution. Typical galaxy redshifts are at $z \leq 0.6$ (Mutz et al. 1994). The set of Cycle 4, 5 and 6 images consists of ~ 150 fields with both V(F606W) and I(F814W) exposures.

This database provides a unique opportunity to search for morphological evidence of AGN or other compact nuclear activity such as starbursts. The nuclear activity of Seyfert galaxies manifests itself morphologically as an unresolved stellar-like point source in the nucleus of the galaxy. This is due to the fact that most of the emission is originating from a small region typically a few parsecs in diameter. For Seyfert 2 nuclei the emission is probably originating over the broader narrow-line region but is still highly concentrated at the nucleus having nuclear $\text{FWHM} \lesssim 200$ pc (Nelson et al. 1996). The physical size of an unresolved region in a WFPC2 image varies with redshift according to Figure 1. The unresolved region at redshifts less than 0.8 obviously encompasses that for Seyfert-like nuclei. Other enhancements of this size in a galaxy profile would include starburst regions and nuclear HII regions. Nuclear starbursts can have sizes of a few hundred parsecs (e.g. Weedman et al. 1981 for NGC 7714) and nuclear HII regions may be even smaller. These stellar enhancements in a galaxy light profile would appear unresolved over the redshift range of interest ($0.2 \lesssim z \lesssim 0.8$) unless H_o is very large. The typical late-type spiral bulge, however, has a diameter of ~ 1 kpc (Boroson 1981) which is resolved in the HST images.

In this study, all galaxies in 70 WFPC2 fields have been modeled to search for unresolved nuclei likely to be AGN or compact regions of star formation, i.e. starbursts. The galaxy modeling is based on maximum likelihood estimates used to extract quantitative morphological and structural parameters of the faint galaxy images. All galaxies to $I \lesssim 21.5$ in 64 MDS fields and 5 Groth survey strip fields (Groth et al. 1998) as well as the Hubble Deep Field to $I \lesssim 23.5$ (Williams et al. 1996) have been modeled in this way to reveal an

unresolved nuclear component when present. The selection of AGN using this technique results in a magnitude-limited sample which is not biased towards galaxies dominated by the nucleus. Many other selection techniques, such as spectroscopic selection, require the nucleus to be the dominant galaxy component. In this way, we probe the intrinsically fainter population of AGN and starbursts out to intermediate redshifts for the first look at how this population of objects evolves.

In this first of two papers, we investigate the process of selecting galaxies containing a nuclear component. The details of processing HST images and issues concerning incompleteness in the sample are also discussed. Additionally, we discuss the ground-based spectroscopic follow-up for the selected galaxies and present the spectra. We also outline a photometric redshift technique used to estimate redshifts for selected galaxies without spectroscopic redshifts. The analysis of the results from this study are presented in the second paper in this series, Sarajedini et al. (1998) (hereafter referred to as Paper II).

2. Selection and Reduction of Survey Fields

The Medium Deep Survey (MDS) is composed of images obtained in parallel while HST observes a primary target with one of the other instruments. The fields were observed in the I (F814W) and V (F606W) filters primarily, with some fields also being imaged with the B (F450W) filter. The data used for this study are comprised entirely of post-refurbishment HST images obtained with the WFPC2 camera from 1994, January to 1996, July. The fields were chosen to lie at a range of high galactic latitudes away from known nearby galaxy clusters and other bright objects.

During this timeframe, the MDS obtained images of 209 survey fields. From these data the fields for this study were chosen to have images in both the V and I filters so that color

information would be available. Each field contained at least one exposure in both V and I with total exposure times ranging from 2000 to 23100 seconds in I and 300 to 16500 seconds in V with a median exposure time of ~ 5000 seconds. The number of exposures per field ranges from 1 to 12 with a median number of exposures at ~ 3 . Table 1 lists the field name, RA and DEC, Galactic latitude, number of exposures and total exposure time in seconds in the V and I filters for each field selected from the MDS for this study. Also included in this table are the six additional non-MDS HST fields used in this study; five fields from the Groth Survey strip (Groth et al. 1998) and the Hubble Deep Field (Williams et al. 1996).

Many of the details of the calibration process can be found in Ratnatunga et al. (1998)⁴ and references therein. Here we will summarize the basic information regarding calibration and reduction of the HST images. The WFPC2 images are calibrated using the STScI static mask, super-Bias, super-Dark and flat field calibration files. These were created by STScI to calibrate the Hubble Deep Field. Flux in fluctuating warm pixels are corrected by hot pixel tables from STScI for the period of observation. The correction is made to ensure that the noise from any residual warm current is smaller than the read noise. Hot pixels which cannot be corrected to that accuracy are rejected.

A corrected version of the IRAF/STSDAS COMBINE task is used to combine the images and generate a “sigma” image from the statistical errors. See Ratnatunga et al. (1994) for a detailed discussion of the stacking procedure and the corrections made to the statistical error determination in the COMBINE algorithm. The sigma image is an estimate of the rms error of every pixel in the calibrated stack and reflects the cosmic ray pixels rejected in the stacking procedure, the flat field response, and any subtracted background sky gradient or scattered Earth light. The amount of shifting necessary between images is determined from “jitter files”, i.e. the HST aspect solution for the WFPC2. Exposures

⁴A draft of this paper is available at <http://astro.phys.cmu.edu/mds/mle/index.html>

are stacked with shifts corresponding to the nearest integer number of pixels. We allow a maximum 50 pixel shift. The orientation usually remains constant although a maximum difference in rotation of less than 0.03 degrees is allowed, ensuring a 1-to-1 mapping of the pixels.

Cosmic rays affect about 7 pixels per second per CCD chip during the length of the exposure time. When three or more exposures in the same filter are available along the same direction with the same orientation, cosmic rays can be effectively removed by stacking the images with a 3-sigma clip. When only two images were available, the stacking operation will leave the fainter cosmic rays on the output image which could be mistakenly detected as faint objects. Cosmic rays can be rejected in images with only one exposure per filter when at least one exposure has been obtained in the other filter. The probability of a cosmic ray hitting the nucleus of one galaxy in the WF chip is appx 20 values for the exposure time and the number of galaxies per chip. This corresponds to $\sim 4\%$ of the galaxies in our study. We are careful, however, to check that none of our detections of nuclear point sources are based on detections in one filter when only one exposure was obtained in that filter.

Once the images are stacked, objects are located independently on each image using an algorithm developed for HST-WFPC data. It is based on finding local maxima and mapping nearby pixels, which are significantly above the noise, to the central object. Objects near the edge or only partially contained on the CCD chip are still be detected. After the initial finding algorithm has been applied, we have the only interactive part of the operation. The image is examined to confirm that it satisfies being part of the Medium Deep Survey and does not contain parts of bright, resolved galaxy fields or globular clusters. Any significant gradient in the sky background, caused by a nearby bright object or scattered Earth light, is subtracted from the stacked image and the object detection algorithm is re-executed. Ghost images or extremities of bright stellar defraction spikes which have been spuriously

detected as objects are deleted during this step. Object detections in the two filters are matched by software to create a single catalog for each image so that corresponding pixels in different filters are associated with the same object.

3. Galaxy Fitting Software

The software for modeling the galaxy light profile has been developed by K. Ratnatunga (Ratnatunga et al. 1998). The empirical model used is scale free and axisymmetric with possible galaxy component profiles consisting of an exponential disk, an $r^{1/4}$ bulge, and an $\exp(-r^2)$ Gaussian profile for a point source. Disk and bulge models have long been used to fit the broad distribution of normal galaxies (e.g. Kormendy 1977) and have been shown to successfully model moderately redshifted galaxies (Schade et al. 1995). A point source component is added to represent an unresolved nuclear AGN or starburst region.

For each galaxy imaged in the HST WFPC2 field, a contour is defined around the object by selecting those pixels which are greater than one-sigma above the estimated local sky level. The signal-to-noise ratio of these pixels are then integrated to produce a good measure of the information content of the image. The decimal logarithm of this integral, called SNRIL, is linearly correlated with the galaxy magnitude as shown in Figure 3 (see Ratnatunga et al. 1998 for a detailed explanation of this parameter). SNRIL behaves mathematically like a signal-to-noise ratio with exposure time. The pixels within the one-sigma contour are used to estimate each galaxy’s center, magnitude, size, orientation, and axis ratio using simple moments of the flux above the mean. An elliptical annular region around the object is selected to define the mean sky background to 0.5% accuracy.

The maximum likelihood parameter estimation starts by using these moments to estimate initially the model parameters. The software creates a model image of the object,

convolves this model with the WFPC2 stellar Point Spread Function (PSF) and compares it with the observations within the selected region. The likelihood function is defined as the probability for each model pixel value with respect to the observed pixel value and its error distribution. The function is evaluated as the integral sum of the logarithm of these probabilities. The likelihood function is maximized using the modified IMSL minimization routine (Ratnatunga & Casertano 1991).

The number and choice of parameters fitted to an image is clearly important and defines the light profile model. In this study, each galaxy is fit down to a limiting SNRIL with 3 different model choices to determine the best fit to the data. The first model is a 2-component disk+bulge model. This version of the fitting software is flexible so that a pure disk, pure bulge, pure Gaussian point source, or bulge+disk model can be chosen as the best fit to the data. The parameters which can be fit in this model are: 1) sky magnitude, 2) x-position, 3) y-position, 4) total magnitude, 5) half-light radius of the bulge+disk model (the radius within which half the light of the unconvolved model would be contained if it were radially symmetric), 6) disk axis ratio, 7) orientation of the galaxy, 8) bulge/(disk+bulge) luminosity ratio, 9) bulge axis ratio and 10) bulge/disk half-light radius ratio.

The first step utilizes a special quick mode of the minimization routine which attempts a 10-parameter disk+bulge fit. It does not check for full convergence but does reach a point in the multi-dimensional parameter space which is close enough to the final answer to investigate the likelihood function and make some intelligent decisions. If the half-light radius of the object is less than one pixel, a 5-parameter Gaussian model is tested to see if the object is point-like. We find that a 5-parameter model is well constrained to a half-light radius of ~ 0.2 pixel. If the point source model does not improve the fit, a single-component disk or bulge model is attempted. Significant improvement in a model is achieved if the

difference in the likelihood function values (the likelihood ratio) is greater than 6.0. This likelihood ratio (LR) is used throughout the modeling process to determine if significant improvements are made with new model fits. The 2-component bulge+disk model is then checked to see if it improves upon the single model bulge or disk fit. The center of the galaxy model is then divided into smaller sub-pixels to see whether a high resolution center will change the likelihood function significantly. The best fit parameters for the chosen model are determined through an iterative process using the model IMSL minimization routine.

The software creates a FITS data image for each object (Figure 2). The image is a grid with a row of 7 images for each filter. Each row contains: 1) the observed 64 x 64 pixel region around the imaged galaxy, 2) the selected pixels identified as part of the galaxy, 3) the PSF convolved maximum likelihood model image, 4) the maximum likelihood model image, 5) the residual image (PSF convolved model subtracted from the real image), 6) the sigma image, 7) the object mask image.

A second modeling option was then applied which allows for a disk+point source fit. The fitting procedure used is the same as the 2 component disk+bulge version. The main difference is that the second component is a Gaussian point source instead of an $r^{1/4}$ bulge component. The parameters for this model are: 1) sky magnitude, 2) x-position, 3) y-position, 4) total magnitude, 5) half-light radius of the disk, 6) disk axis ratio, 7) orientation of the galaxy, 8) point source/(disk+point source) luminosity ratio, 9) x difference in position between the disk and point source and 10) y difference in position between the disk and point source.

The point source is allowed to be at a different origin from that of the disk component. This technique avoids the problem of not converging on a real point source because it is not at the precise center of the disk. Later in the selection process, restrictions can be placed on

how far off-center the point source nucleus can be and still be considered a “nucleus”. The half-light radius of the Gaussian component representing the point source is 0.02 arcsec; the radius before convolution with the point spread function. This is consistent with that measured for stars in the WFPC2 fields and is essentially a measurement of the telescope “jitter”. The axis ratio for this component is 1.0.

A third modeling option allows for a 3-component disk+bulge+point source fit to the galaxy light profile. This model is somewhat more complicated than the previous versions due to the third component. The parameters fit for this model are: 1) sky magnitude, 2) x-position, 3) y-position, 4) total magnitude, 5) half-light radius of the disk+bulge portion of the model without regard to light from the point source nucleus, 6) disk axis ratio, 7) orientation of the galaxy, 8) bulge/(disk+bulge+point source) luminosity ratio, 9) bulge axis ratio, 10) bulge/(bulge+disk) half-light radius ratio, 11) point source/(disk+bulge+point source) luminosity ratio, 12) x difference in position, 13) y difference in position. Parameters 12 and 13 reflect the fact that the point source is allowed to have a different origin from the remainder of the galaxy model. Again, the half-light radius of the Gaussian component is 0.02 arcsec and the axis ratio is 1.0.

4. Selection of Galaxies Containing Nuclear Point Sources

Each galaxy is fitted with all three versions of the fitting software. The model with the lowest likelihood function value indicates the best fit or the closest model to the real data. Those galaxies best fit with either the disk+point source model or the disk+bulge+point source model are initially selected as nuclear point source candidates. It is important, however, to understand whether or not the model containing a point source component is substantially better than one without the point source component. This is important since a model with more parameters is more likely to have a lower likelihood function value and

be chosen as the best fit. In the following sections we describe various simulations and tests designed to determine the criteria for selecting a galaxy containing a nuclear point source.

4.1. Spurious Point Source Detections in Simulated Galaxies

To determine the uniqueness of a fit with a galaxy model containing a point source, simulated galaxies with no point source component were fit in the same way as galaxies in the survey. These simulated galaxies have a range of magnitudes, signal-to-noise ratios, bulge-to-total light ratios and half light radii and were produced in both V and I images where the V magnitude of each galaxy is one magnitude fainter than the I magnitude. Each of the 1152 galaxies in this simulation were fit with a disk+bulge model, disk+point source model, and a disk+bulge+point source model.

The model with the lowest likelihood function value is chosen as the best fit. The simulations are used to determine what minimum likelihood ratio must be met by the model containing a point source over the model not containing a point source. In 30% of the cases, the simulated galaxies without a nuclear point source component, were found to have a best fit model which *did* include a point source nucleus. The likelihood ratio between the non-point source component model and the point source component model for these fits determines the range in likelihood ratios for spurious point source detections.

The likelihood ratio (LR) values for the simulated galaxies where the point source component model gave the best fit are found to occur at small point source-to-total values. This simply means that the spurious detections tend to be faint nuclei ($\lesssim 1\%$ of the total galaxy luminosity). Applying a 1% point source-to-total luminosity ratio cut-off to these data eliminates 75% of the spurious detections. The vast majority of the remaining spurious detections were found to have LR values ≤ 50 . We remind the reader that the LR value is

a measure of the difference in the likelihood function values for two different model fits. The larger the LR, the greater the difference in the two model fits being compared. In this case, we are comparing the model fit including a point source to one that does not include a point source and the LR reflects the degree to which the model including a point source component is a better fit.

These simulations indicate that choosing a best fit galaxy model where the point source-to-total luminosity ratio is greater than 1% and the LR value is greater than 50 will avoid almost all spurious point source detections. Of the 1152 galaxies in this simulation, only 4 would still be selected after applying these criteria resulting in 0.3% of fitted galaxies which could contain spurious point source detections.

4.2. Measurement of Detected Point Source Nuclei

Not only is it important to determine how often spurious detections will occur in our galaxy sample using simulated galaxies, we also need to define when and how often inaccurately measured point source nuclei are detected in the sample. For the purposes of determining completeness and to quantify the frequency of inaccurately measured point source nuclei, a partially simulated galaxy dataset was produced. The dataset consists of real galaxy images from several MDS fields where simulated point sources of various magnitudes were added at the nucleus. A total of 98 galaxies from 10 MDS fields were used in this Monte-Carlo type simulation. Each galaxy image was reproduced 10 times and had added to it point sources of apparent magnitudes evenly distributed between $I=21.5$ to 26.0 and $V=22.5$ to 27.0 . A total of 1960 simulated galaxy images were created in this way (98 galaxies x 10 point source magnitudes x 2 filters (V and I)).

The galaxies with simulated point source nuclei had a variety of bulge-to-total ratios,

apparent magnitudes, and SNRIL values (Figure 3). The 2-component disk+bulge model, the 2-component disk+point source model, and the 3-component disk+bulge+point source model were applied to each of the simulated galaxies. The best fit model was determined as that with the lowest likelihood function value. To be selected as a galaxy containing a nuclear point source component, we required that the point source be at least 1% of the galaxy light and that the likelihood ratio for the model containing the point source component be lower by a value of 50 than the model without a point source component. These criteria were applied to avoid spurious point source detections as described above and will also be applied to the real galaxy sample. To provide a check on our likelihood ratio requirement, we examined the increase in detected real point sources in this set of simulations as compared to the increase in spurious detections made with a lower likelihood ratio requirement. We find that the increase in detected real point sources is negligible ($\sim$ few%) compared to the doubling of spurious detections when the likelihood ratio is lowered from 50 to 30 and therefore maintain the current likelihood ratio requirements for detecting nuclear point sources.

Based on the results from this simulation, we determined how well the input nuclear point source is detected and how accurately its magnitude is measured. Figure 4 shows how the measured magnitude of every detected point source in the simulated data compares with its input V and I magnitudes. Although many of the points fall near the input magnitude values, $\sim$ 8% are measured brighter than the input magnitude by more than 2 magnitudes. Careful examination of the model fits for these cases indicate that they are galaxies containing significant bulge contributions ($\geq$ 50% of the total galaxy light). The bulge appears to often confuse the magnitude measurement of the point source component. For this reason, it is necessary to set additional selection criteria for point source detections to avoid inaccurately measuring point source magnitudes.

Because our data contain information in both the V and I filters, we can compare the model in the two different filters and note any oddities. First, many of the poorly measured point source nuclei detected in one filter were undetected in the other filter. This result is not unacceptable unless the measurement of the bulge is very different in the two filters. It is clear that the bulge is affecting the point source measurement in the case where a large bulge contribution is measured in one filter while a point source is detected with no bulge component in the other filter. We therefore try to remove from our sample those point sources measured to be too bright due to the contamination by bulge light in the point source component. We note all the cases in the simulated data where the bulge is measured to be $\geq 25\%$ in one filter and a point source with no bulge component is measured in the other filter. In the simulated dataset, 69 point sources are detected in galaxies fulfilling this criterion. These point sources were neither preferentially bluer or redder than the underlying galaxy. Removal of these points eliminates $\sim 80\%$ of the point source nuclei in Figure 4 measured as too bright.

These simulations also show that if the galaxy contains a large bulge component in both filters and the point source is the same color in (V-I) as the galaxy, it is often measuring the point source magnitude incorrectly. We also know that many elliptical galaxies have “cuspy” luminosity profiles (Lauer et al. 1995) which can easily be mistaken for unresolved nuclei in moderately redshifted galaxies. If a small point source is placed in these galaxies in our simulations, a bright point source may be measured due to the inclusion of the cuspy light from the galaxy itself. In these cases, we would expect the color of the point source to be the same as the galaxy, within the errors. We find 77 instances in this simulation where the point source color and the total galaxy color are the same.

Finally, the matrix solution of the light profile model is examined for each galaxy in which a point source is detected. Occasionally, the model does not converge which is easily

identified by rows of zero values in the matrix solution. A total of 56 galaxies best fit with a point source model were removed due to the non-convergence of the point source component in the model.

Figure 5 shows the measured magnitude vs. the input magnitude for the remaining 597 selected point source galaxies after removing the subsets of systematically inaccurate and non-converging point source models described above. These additional selection criteria have successfully removed the majority of poorly measured point source nuclei. The solid line represents the one-to-one relationship between input and output magnitudes. The dashed vertical errorbars are the standard deviation error in the real point source nucleus magnitude as a function of the measured magnitude based on the spread of the points in the figure. We show in Figure 6 histograms of $\text{mag}_{\text{obs}} - \text{mag}_{\text{real}}$ for point sources at 23 ± 0.25 and 24 ± 0.25 magnitudes. The dashed line is the normalized Gaussian distribution for the calculated σ_{mag} of each distribution. We note that the distribution is narrower than the normalized Gaussian distribution and therefore the adopted errors are conservative and may overestimate the actual error in magnitude for many of the measured point sources. A least squares fit to these 1σ errors as a function of observed magnitude yields the following equation,

$$\sigma_{\text{mag}} = 0.324 - 0.0685 \times (23 - \text{mag}) + 0.0075 \times (23 - \text{mag})^2 \quad (1)$$

which gives the error in magnitude determination as a function of the measured magnitude. This equation is later applied to the real point source nuclei detected in the sample to obtain an error estimator for the true magnitude.

5. Accuracy of the Host Galaxy Bulge Measurements

Figure 5 shows that the point source nuclei can be accurately measured to ± 0.40 magnitude for faint (24th magnitude) nuclei and ± 0.26 magnitude for bright (22nd

magnitude) nuclei. In spite of fairly accurate nuclear magnitude determinations, we find that the bulge component is often misfit in our simulations. Figure 7a reveals how the bulge-to-bulge+disk luminosity ratio ($B/B+D$) in the simulation galaxies differs from that measured for these galaxies once a point source nucleus has been added and detected. It is clear from the numerous points at $(B/B+D)_{measured} = 0$ that the bulge component is often not measured at all when a point source is present. This is most likely caused by the tendency of the modeling software to chose a model with fewer parameters and therefore fewer components as the best fit unless the fit is greatly improved by additional parameters. When a prominent point source is present, even a large bulge component can go undetected.

Figure 7b reveals how the measured bulge-to-bulge+disk ratio ($B/B+D$) varies with the point source-to-total luminosity ratio. For point source nuclei greater than $\simeq 20\%$ of the total galaxy light, the bulge is almost always undetected ($(B/B+D)_{measured} = 0$) and appears to be dominated by the point source component. Only where the point source is below 20% of the galaxy light can we adequately measure the bulge component of the galaxy in addition to the point source component.

The results of these simulations suggest that although the bulge is often measured incorrectly when a point source is detected, the magnitude of the detected point source is correct within the determined errors. For this reason, our main goals of determining nuclear magnitudes and colors are unaffected by these errors in measuring the bulge contribution. We discuss in Paper II how these results effect the determination of the host galaxy types and colors and attempt to statistically correct for errors in the bulge measurement in our sample.

6. Completeness

To determine the level of completeness in this survey, a Monte-Carlo simulation was performed. The dataset used for this experiment is that described above, where real galaxy images are combined with point source nuclei of varying magnitudes. The fitting software is then used to determine the best fit model to the data. After applying the criteria to ensure accurately measured, real nuclear point source components, we determine the number of galaxies in which the unresolved nucleus is detected. Since each galaxy in the simulation contains a point source for which the input apparent magnitude is known, the level of completeness in detecting nuclei as a function of the point source brightness can be determined.

To eliminate spurious point source detections, each detected point source must be at least 1% of the total galaxy light based on modeling of simulated galaxies described previously in section 4.1. For this reason, very faint nuclei are not detected in bright galaxies but a nucleus of the same magnitude might be detected in a fainter galaxy if it is above the 1% limit. Because of the related nature of detected nuclei and the magnitude of the host galaxy, we cannot address the issue of completeness in terms of limiting magnitudes. Instead, the level of completeness in detecting point source nuclei is based on the percentage of galaxy light that the point source comprises.

We begin by estimating completeness for those galaxies in which no bulge component is detected. These galaxies are adequately modeled in our sample with a pure exponential disk. The galaxies, which contain simulated point source nuclei of varying point source-to-total luminosity ratios, were fitted with the fitting software and those containing accurately measured point source components were selected. Figure 8a shows a histogram of the number of galaxies in the simulation for which there was no input bulge component as a function of the input point source-to-total luminosity ratio (solid line). The hatched region

represents the histogram of galaxies in which the point source nucleus was detected and no bulge component was measured, consistent with the input bulge parameter value. Figure 8b is the fraction of galaxies as a function of input point source-to-total luminosity ratio in which the point source was accurately modeled. The error bars are the Poisson 1σ error based on the number of points in each bin. These fractional values can be applied to those galaxies in the real survey sample containing no measured bulge component to determine the level of completeness in detecting point sources.

Estimating completeness for the galaxies containing a bulge component is somewhat more complicated. For the rest of this discussion we define the bulge component in terms of bulge-to-bulge+disk (B/B+D) luminosity ratio so that a galaxy with no disk has a luminosity ratio of 1.0. Figure 7 indicates that when a point source is detected, the galaxy B/B+D may be quite inaccurate, especially if the point source-to-total luminosity ratio is greater than 20%. For this reason, to estimate completeness for the galaxies in our sample containing some bulge component, it is best to separate our simulation results into bins of different *input* B/B+D values as opposed to using the measured B/B+D values. This is consistent with the null hypothesis approach we have adopted for modeling the galaxy light profile: we assume that each galaxy does not contain a point source and the galaxy light profile model must be significantly improved with the point source component for the nucleus to be detected.

Figure 9 is plotted similarly to Figure 8. The three left panels show the histogram of galaxies in the simulation (solid line) and those for which the point source nucleus was detected (hatched region) for different input B/B+D galaxy types. The Figure 9a represents galaxies with $0 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.4$, 9b is for galaxies with $0.4 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.8$ and 9c is for $0.8 < (B/B+D) \leq 1.0$. The adjacent panels on the right indicate the percentage of point sources detected as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio and is an

estimate of the completeness. These percentage estimates can be applied to the real sample galaxy B/B+D distribution to estimate completeness as a function of point source -to-total luminosity ratio for the entire survey. An estimate of the total completeness in detecting point source nuclei for the survey data is calculated in the next section based upon the outcome of this simulation.

7. Application to the Survey Data

7.1. Determining the Limiting Signal-to-Noise for Each MDS Field

Every galaxy in each of the fields listed in Table 1 was fitted down to an apparent magnitude limit corresponding to a SNRIL value of 2.5. This limit is reached at an integrated galaxy magnitude of $I \simeq 22.0$ for the average MDS field but varies with exposure time as signal-to-noise. As explained in section 3, SNRIL is the integrated signal-to-noise ratio of galaxy pixels above one-sigma of the sky. The decimal logarithm of this value is the parameter SNRIL. The SNRIL value of 2.5 corresponds to the signal-to-noise level required for accurate fitting of the simple disk+bulge model (Ratnatunga et al. 1998). For the model requiring an additional point source component, the SNRIL fitting limit should be higher.

To determine the SNRIL limit for the data, we again use the simulated dataset consisting of real galaxies with added simulated point source nuclei. As shown in Figure 3, these galaxies cover a range of SNRIL values. These data can be used to determine at what SNRIL value for the galaxy is the point source nucleus no longer detected. Figure 10 is the histogram of the measured SNRIL values for the galaxies in this simulation. To avoid some of the incompleteness based on faint point sources as described in the preceeding section, this histogram includes only points measuring greater than 3% of the total galaxy light. In Figure 10a and 10b the solid line is the total number of galaxies as a function of SNRIL

and the hatched region is the number of galaxies where the added point source component was detected. The solid line in Figure 10a represents all galaxies in the simulation where the galaxy contained no initial bulge component and the hatched region is the number of galaxies in this set where the 2-component disk+point source model was the best fit. Figure 10b represents all of the galaxies which did contain an initial bulge component. The hatched region represents the galaxies in this set best fit with a 2-component disk+point source model or a 3-component disk+bulge+point source model. The cross hatched region represents those galaxies for which the 3-component model was the best fit.

It is clear that the 2-component disk+point source model detects point sources in galaxies with lower SNRIL values than the 3-component model. This result is expected since this model requires fewer fitted parameters than the 3-component model. The 3-component model is much more incomplete overall than the 2-component disk+point source model. The 3-component model fits some galaxies down to SNRIL=3.0 while the 2-component disk+point source fits some down to SNRIL=2.7. To ensure that all galaxies in the sample can be fit with either the 2 or 3-component model, the limiting SNRIL value required for galaxies to be included in this study is 3.0. Setting the SNRIL value lower would introduce a bias against detecting point source nuclei in galaxies with significant bulge components and SNRIL<3.0.

The total number of galaxies in each of the 70 fields which have SNRIL values greater than or equal to 3.0 in one or both filters is 1033, an average of 13.5 galaxies per typical WFPC2 field (106 galaxies lie above this limit in the HDF). The last three columns of Table 1 show the limiting apparent V magnitude and I magnitude corresponding to this SNRIL value in each field and the number of galaxies in each I band field above this limiting value.

7.2. Selected Galaxies Containing Nuclear Point Sources

The output image containing the model and residual for every galaxy in the survey was visually inspected to ensure that the model is correct and no obvious errors have occurred in the fitting process. The best fit model is then determined as the one with the lowest likelihood ratio value. The criteria for selecting a galaxy where the best model fit contains a point source component have been discussed in detail in the preceding sections. Initially, the model must be the best fit, having a likelihood ratio between the point source and non-point source model greater than 50. The point source component must also comprise at least 1% of the total galaxy light to avoid spurious point source detections. After applying these criteria to the data, the galaxies in each field which are best fit with an additional point source component are re-examined to determine if the point source location is near the nucleus of the host galaxy. This procedure is done to avoid fitting bright knots of star formation in the arms and disks of spiral galaxies or other noisy features. The point source is usually within $\simeq 0.2''$ (2 pixels in the WF chip) of the host galaxy center. Some, however, lie further from the galaxy center if the galaxy is very asymmetric. Occasionally, a galaxy is so irregular that it is difficult to determine the location of the nucleus and these galaxies were never selected as having point source nuclei because of this difficulty. A total of 10 galaxies in the Hubble Deep Field and 20 in the remaining 69 fields fall into this latter category.

We next apply the criteria for accurately measured nuclear point source components determined from the simulations in section 4.2. The following is a summary of the number of galaxies which contained a point source component in their best fit model but were rejected based on these criteria. Eight galaxies were removed because of non-convergence of the point source component in the model. Twenty-one were removed because the point source was detected in one filter while the other filter measured no point source (or a much

smaller one) and the bulge/total luminosity ratio was greater by 0.25 than that measured in the other filter. Forty-nine were removed because the galaxy appeared to be elliptical-like (bulge-to-total ≥ 0.8) and the point source component had the same V-I color as the galaxy, indicating that the measured point source is likely a cuspy portion of the bulge.

After removing these galaxies from the selected sample we have a total of 8 galaxies in the Hubble Deep Field and 93 in the remaining 69 WFPC2 fields which are best fit with a galaxy model containing a nuclear point source component and meet all of the criteria described above. This selection results in direct detection of $7.5\% \pm 2.7\%$ of the galaxies in the Hubble Deep Field and $10.0\% \pm 1\%$ of the galaxies in the remaining fields with nuclear point source components. Seventy-two of the point source nuclei were detected in both the V and I filter images, 8 were detected in the V image alone, and 21 were detected in the I image alone. The typical reason for non-detection in one of the filters is that the nucleus is too faint in that filter image. However, in six cases the point source component did not converge properly in the other filter and the magnitude was therefore considered unreliable. The fraction of selected galaxies containing point source nuclei detected in the PC chip is appx 7the same as that expected based on the difference in surface area between the PC and the 3 WF chips.

Figure 11 is a gray-scale I band image of the selected galaxies. The images are scaled in nuclear flux and are sorted in decsending order of point source-to-total luminosity ratio so that the galaxies with the brightest relative point source nuclei are first. The spiral structure in many of the larger galaxies is clearly visible. Some of the nuclei are too faint to be detected by eye in this image; although, it is useful for noting the range of sizes and galaxy types of the host galaxies. Figure 12 shows the point source magnitude vs. the integrated magnitude of the galaxy in I (a) and V (b). The unresolved nuclear point sources range in magnitude from $27 \lesssim I \lesssim 21$. The faintest galaxies (fainter than $I \simeq 21.5$) are from the

HDF. The error in the point source magnitude has been adjusted to reflect the expected error based on simulations in section 4.2. Most of the nuclei (87%) comprise less than 20% of the total galaxy light with 59% comprising less than 5%.

Table 2 lists the important fitted parameters for the 101 galaxies containing nuclear point sources. The table lists the ID number (1), the object name (2), the I magnitude of the galaxy model (3) and its error (4), natural log of the I filter half-light radius in arcseconds (5) and its error (6), the V-I galaxy color (7) and its error (8), the I Bulge-to-Total measurement (9), the I Point source-to-Total measurement (10), the V Point source-to-Total measurement (11), and the V-I color of the point source (12) with its error (13). The error in the point source color reflects the empirically determined error of the point source magnitude from the simulations. The object coordinates are given in Table 4.

The completeness in detecting point source galaxies can be determined based on the simulations of the previous section. Figures 8 and 9 give the completeness as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio for galaxies with various B/B+D measurements. These completeness estimates can be combined to determine the overall completeness of the survey in detecting point source nuclei as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio. To do this, we weight the completeness estimates by the number of galaxies in the total survey with the corresponding B/B+D measurement. Of the 1033 galaxies in the survey, 282 have $B/B+D=0$, 409 have $0 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.4$, 194 have $0.4 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.8$, and 148 have $0.8 < (B/B+D) \leq 1.0$. Combining the completeness estimates in Figures 8 and 9 weighted by the numbers of survey galaxies in each bin yields the overall completeness estimate for the survey illustrated in Figure 13. For nuclei comprising only a few percent of the galaxy light, we are $\sim 25\%$ complete in detecting these over the full range of galaxy types in our sample. For nuclei greater than 10% of the galaxy light, we are $\gtrsim 60\%$ complete. Most of the incompleteness stems from the inability to detect faint nuclei in galaxies with

large or medium sized bulge components.

We can correct for the apparent incompleteness by applying these estimates to the number of point sources detected in each point source-to-total luminosity bin. For example, the total number of point source nuclei in our sample comprising between 1% and 2% of the total galaxy light is 19 ± 4.4 . The apparent completeness in this bin, according to Figure 13, is $12.1 \pm 3.6\%$. If we adjust our sample for this level of incompleteness, the total number of nuclear point sources in our survey could be as high as 157 ± 59 having point source-to-total luminosity ratios between 1% and 2%. If each bin is adjusted for incompleteness in this way, the fraction of all galaxies which contain nuclear point sources down to 1% of the galaxy light could be as high as $36.4 \pm 6.7\%$. Figure 14a illustrates how the fraction of galaxies containing unresolved nuclei varies as the limiting point source-to-total luminosity ratio changes. The solid line represents the uncorrected counts and the dashed line represents the corrected number counts according to the incompleteness estimates described above. The high level of incompleteness at the faint end (where the point source is 1-2% of the total galaxy light) causes the adjusted fraction of galaxies to increase sharply when extending the survey to these faint limits. Figure 14b shows the completeness adjustment factor as a function of point source-to-total luminosity ratio limit. At a limit of 5% this factor appears to level off at about 0.6. The behavior of the completeness adjustment factor indicates that the statistically significant point source-to-total luminosity ratio limit appears to be from $\sim 3\%$ to 5% . Figure 14a shows that at this limit the total fraction of galaxies containing a nuclear point source component is $\sim 9\%$ to 16% corrected for incompleteness.

8. Spectroscopy

Ground-based spectroscopic follow-up for the galaxies imaged with HST is an important part of the science objectives of the Medium Deep Survey. Spectra allow us to

determine redshifts for the host galaxies for construction of an accurate luminosity function of the unresolved nuclei. Spectra also allow us to associate detected emission lines with morphological properties and confirm the identification of LLAGNs or starburst nuclei for the brightest candidates. Additional spectra of MDS galaxies in the field were obtained to address other scientific questions about the nature of moderately redshifted galaxies (see Im et al. 1996; Mutz et al. 1994).

Spectra were obtained with the Kitt Peak 4-meter telescope using the Cryogenic Camera. For details see "Low-to-Moderate Resolution Optical Spectroscopy Manual for Kitt Peak" (Massey et al. 1997). The detector is a dedicated Loral (Ford) 800x1200 pixel device with relatively good cosmetics in a fast (f/1) camera-dewar combination. Total system throughput (telescope + spectrograph + CCD) is typically 20%. This instrument allows for use of multi-slit masks so that several targets can be exposed at the same time. For each field, 1 to 3 masks were designed based on astrometry taken from the WFPC2 images. Each mask exposed between 4 and 10 galaxies with a typical mask exposing 6 galaxy targets at once. Using this technique, most galaxies in each field could be observed down to a limiting magnitude of $I \sim 21.0$.

Observations of WFPC2 imaged galaxies were made during observing runs in 1994 October, 1995 April, 1996 January, 1996 July, and 1996 September. A total of 19 nights at the 4 meter telescope was allocated for this project during these 5 observing runs. Due to poor weather, 6 nights were lost yielding a total of 13 nights. Grism #650 was used during the October '94 run while Grism #770 was used for the subsequent runs since the longer wavelength range was desirable for observing emission lines of higher redshift galaxies. The wavelength range for Grism #650 is 4000 to 6800 Å with a resolution (using a 2.5" slit) of 12 Å. For the more frequently used Grism #770, the wavelength range is 4300 to 8500 Å with a resolution of 15 Å through a 2.5" slit. The gain was set to 1.5 e⁻/ADU and the

readnoise was typically 15 electrons for all observing runs. The wavelength range allows for coverage of the H&K Calcium lines and 4000Å blanketing break, 3727 Å [OII], 5007/4959 Å [OIII], and several other emission and absorption features out to $z \simeq 0.8$. However, the actual redshift range detectable for each object varies somewhat due to the galaxy position within the focal plane.

Typically, 2 to 3 one-hour exposures were required for each multi-slit mask to achieve a signal-to-noise of at least 10 for a galaxy of $I \simeq 20.0$. Calibration images consisted of quartz flats obtained for each mask, HeNeAr lamp images obtained before and after each mask observation, and bias frames obtained at the beginning of each night.

The data were reduced using several IRAF routines outlined in the manual “Multi-Slits at Kitt Peak” (DeVeney et al. 1996). At least 20 bias frames were averaged together for each night of observing and were subtracted from all images taken that night using CCDPROC. Bad CCD columns were removed from all images by interpolation using FIXPIX. Quartz lamp images for each individual mask were averaged together using FLATCOMBINE. Next, APFLATTEN was used to flatten the flat field for each mask leaving an image which represents the pixel-to-pixel gain variations in the CCD. The resulting flat field no longer has spatial (slit-function) information. This is appropriate for the quartz lamp exposures of multi-slit masks since the short slit length ($\sim 10''$ to $20''$) doesn’t reveal much slow variation along the spatial direction. Each aperture is fit with an appropriate polynomial to remove the overall shape of the quartz lamp flat. Typically, this was a legendre polynomial with order = 20 to 30. The flat field correction was then applied to each mask image (object images as well as comparison lamp images) using CCDPROC.

Before extracting the spectra, the individual object frames for each mask were usually combined using IMCOMBINE. In some cases, if the telescope had been moved slightly between exposures, each object frame was extracted separately. The comparison lamp

frames for each mask were also combined before extracting. To extract the object spectra, APALL was used to set and fit the background (sky region) of each aperture as well as setting the object region. The spectra were traced and interactively fit using this task. The resulting image contains the object spectrum for each aperture with variance weighting, the object spectrum without variance weighting, the sky spectrum for each aperture, and the error spectrum for each aperture. The HeNeAr comparison images are then extracted using the APSUM task with the object apertures set identically to those in the the object image extractions. The emission lines in each of the comparison spectra are then identified and this dispersion solution is applied to the appropriate aperture object spectrum in each of the images using DISPCOR.

9. Redshift Determination

For each spectrum with obvious emission lines and/or absorption features, a redshift estimate was first determined by measuring the emission wavelengths of two or more features and comparing them with the known rest wavelengths. Cross-correlation with a template galaxy spectrum containing similar features was used to accurately determine the true redshift for the object. We used FXCOR in IRAF to do the cross-correlation. The galaxy template spectra are from Kennicutt (1992) for various galaxy types. At least 5 different templates were employed depending on the galaxy type for which the redshift was being determined. A parabolic fit to the peak in the cross-correlation function determined the redshift and provided a formal error in the redshift determination based upon this fit.

In some cases only one emission or absorption line was obvious. If the redshift determination was based on only one line or two weak features, it is marked as uncertain (?) in the redshift list. Some galaxy spectra contained adequate signal but no obvious emission or absorption features were noted at all. The cross-correlation technique was also

employed with these spectra to determine if weaker absorption or emission features could be detected. In these cases, if a redshift was determined for the spectra, it was marked as very uncertain (??) in the final redshift list.

A total of 253 objects were observed through slitlet masks over the 5 observing runs. Of these objects, 136 had enough signal present in the spectra to detect emission lines or possible absorption features so that a redshift could be determined. This yields a success rate of 54% in obtaining MDS galaxy redshifts. The majority of these galaxies for which redshifts were determined are non-nuclear point source galaxies.

As discussed previously, a total of 101 galaxies were found to contain nuclear point sources, including galaxies from the Groth strip and HDF. The spectroscopic follow-up pursued in this study includes only MDS fields. Other groups have obtained spectroscopic follow-up for the non-MDS fields which we use to complement our redshift survey.

Of the 101 galaxies containing nuclear point sources, 77 are in MDS fields with the remaining 24 observed in the Groth strip and HDF. Of the 77 galaxies selected from the MDS fields which contain nuclear components, 35 have been observed through slitlets at the 4 meter. Figure 15 shows the 35 spectra where the prominent absorption and/or emission features have been indicated. Adequate signal along with emission or absorption features were detected in 29 of these spectra allowing their redshifts to be determined. The dashed line is the arbitrarily scaled error spectrum indicating regions where night sky lines affected the object spectrum. The redshift is shown in the upper left corner of each spectrum under the object name. Uncertain redshifts are indicated with question marks. We also show in the upper right corner an ID number corresponding to the ID number in Figure 11 allowing each spectrum to be matched to its image. The spectra are arranged in order of decreasing contribution of the nucleus to the galaxy light.

There are on average 1.2 galaxies containing unresolved nuclei per WFPC2 field. For

every MDS field observed at the 4 meter, slitlets were placed on those galaxies containing nuclear components with the remainder placed on other relatively bright ($I \lesssim 21.0$) galaxies in the field. Because of the sparseness of the nucleated galaxies in each field, it was difficult to obtain spectroscopic observations for the entire sample of 77 galaxies in 13 nights of 4 meter time with the typical total exposure time per field being 3 hours. As mentioned above, only 35 of the compact nuclei galaxies were observed and 29 (38% of the 77 galaxies) yielded good spectra for redshift determination. We then include the compact nuclei galaxies from the HDF (Cohen et al. 1996) and Groth strip (Koo et al. 1996) for which redshifts are taken from the literature. Of the 24 compact nuclei galaxies in these 2 fields, 6 had published redshifts. When we include these fields we have 35 compact nuclei galaxies with known redshifts representing 35% of the 101 selected galaxies.

10. Spectroscopic Identifications for Nuclear Point Source Galaxies

The nuclei are typically too faint to contribute much light to the galaxy spectrum. For this reason, we do not expect to see the spectrum of the nucleus in these observations. The typical resolution at the 4 meter is $1''$ which is comparable to the galaxy size in most cases. This level of resolution combined with the faintness of the nuclei makes it impossible to study the nuclear spectrum separate from that of the host galaxy.

As mentioned previously, the spectra in Figure 15 are arranged in order of decreasing contribution of the nucleus to the total galaxy light. Interestingly, we find that the first two spectra displayed, the galaxies with the brightest nuclear point source components (ua400-7 and uwy02-4), reveal broad emission lines indicative of Seyfert 1-type galaxies. In the case of ua400-7, we see broad MgII in addition to [NeV] and [NeIII] emission lines. The spectrum of uwy02-4 reveals broad $H\beta$ as well as narrow line [OII] and [OIII] emission. In addition, usa00-35, where the nucleus is 20% of the galaxy V filter light, has a flux

ratio of $([\text{OIII}] \lambda 5007)/(\text{H}\beta \lambda 4861) \simeq 5$. We also detect $\text{H}\alpha$ but not $[\text{SII}]$ in the spectrum. We determine the $([\text{SII}] \lambda 6725)/(\text{H}\alpha \lambda 6563)$ flux ratio limit to be $\simeq 0.4$. According to the line ratio diagnostics of Veilleux & Osterbrock (1987), this is likely to be a Seyfert 2 nucleus. These spectroscopic identifications provide a check that our technique to search for unresolved nuclei is sensitive to Seyfert-like nuclei present in the survey galaxies.

The remainder of the spectra contain a variety of emission and absorption features. Of the 29 spectra with adequate signal-to-noise for redshift determination, 18 display narrow $3727 \text{ \AA}$ $[\text{OII}]$ emission and/or $5007/4959 \text{ \AA}$ $[\text{OIII}]$ emission. Hydrogen emission lines of $\text{H}\beta$ and/or $\text{H}\alpha$ are seen in 13 of the spectra. The CaII H and K absorption and $4000 \text{ \AA}$ blanketing break are seen in 22 of the 29 spectra. These spectra can be used to classify the host galaxy types. Based on spectral features, 19 have spectra consistent with mid to late type spirals while 10 are consistent with early type galaxies from Sa to ellipticals. These classifications are used in Paper II in comparison with the bulge-to-total luminosity ratio classifications for the host galaxies.

11. Photometric Redshifts

Our observing strategy was to place slitlets on those galaxies containing nuclear components with the remainder placed on other relatively bright ($I \lesssim 21.0$) galaxies in the field. As described previously, all compact nuclei galaxies from the MDS, HDF and Groth strip for which redshifts are known make up 35% of the 101 compact nuclei galaxies. For the remainder of our sample, we can estimate redshifts based on several host galaxy parameters.

To determine redshifts “photometrically”, it is necessary to have as large a database as possible of galaxies with measured redshifts and HST images for high resolution photometry. All MDS fields used in this study are imaged in both the V and I filters. We obtained good

spectra for 136 galaxies for which redshifts could be determined. Highly reliable redshifts are determined for 102 of these galaxies, where the redshift is based on at least two strong emission or absorption features. At the time of this study, several redshifts had been published from the HDF (Cohen et al. 1996). Of the HDF galaxies fit with our modeling software, 47 have reliable redshifts published. For the Groth strip, 25 modeled galaxies have reliable published redshifts (Koo et al. 1996). We then removed from these samples any galaxies with poorly fit parameters such as non-convergence of the model in one filter or very irregular morphology. Because the bulge-to-total measurement will be used in the empirical fit, it is important to remove highly irregular galaxies for which the bulge-to-total luminosity ratio less is meaningful. This leaves us with 129 galaxies with excellent model fits where the bulge-to-total luminosity ratio, magnitude and V-I color have been well determined.

Figure 16 demonstrates how the color, magnitude, and bulge-to-total luminosity ratio vary as a function of the galaxy redshift. If we break down our sample into different bulge-to-total bins, we see that the relationship between magnitude, color and redshift becomes tighter since we confine ourselves to galaxies of a similar Hubble type. An empirical fit to the data in different bulge-to-total bins will allow for redshift estimation based entirely on color, magnitude and bulge-to-total luminosity ratio. Initially, we also included the half-light radius in the empirical fit to determine redshift but found that it was not a useful parameter in constraining the redshift.

We use the fitting software GaussFit (McArthur et al. 1994) to perform a least-squares linear regression in 3 dimensions to determine redshift as a function of magnitude and color according to the equation below.

$$z_{est} = C1 \times color + C2 \times mag + C3 \quad (2)$$

where C1 and C2 are the coefficients of color and magnitude and C3 is the zero point of

the fit. The data were divided into various subsamples of limited bulge-to-total ratios and the fitted z values were compared with the input redshifts to determine the 1σ error in the calculated redshift. It was found that among the galaxies having bulge-to-total ratios less than 0.5, 2 galaxies with $z \geq 0.8$ fell far from the linear fit. Since so few data points exist beyond $z=0.8$, we cannot attempt to estimate redshifts accurately beyond this limit. Therefore, these 2 galaxies were removed from the dataset allowing for a much better fit to the remaining data points. After removing these 2 data points, we are left with 127 points in the fit.

The GaussFit fitting procedure was applied to various subsamples of the total galaxy dataset of 127 points. In Figures 17 through 20 we show the fitting results for subsamples of the data separated into bulge-to-total luminosity ratio bins. Large bulge-to-total bins were chosen so that uncertainties in the determination of the bulge component in galaxies where a nuclear point source is also detected will not significantly affect the redshift estimation. Figure 17 contains galaxies with $\text{Bulge}/\text{Total} \leq 0.2$, those with $\text{Bulge}/\text{Total} \leq 0.5$ are in Figure 18, those with $\text{Bulge}/\text{Total} > 0.5$ are in Figure 19, and Figure 20 contains those with $\text{Bulge}/\text{Total} \geq 0.8$. In each figure, a) is the I magnitude for the galaxies vs. their measured redshifts, b) is the V-I galaxy color vs. the redshift, c) is the estimated redshift based on the fit vs. the measured redshift, and d) is the residual ($z_{\text{measured}} - z_{\text{est}}$) vs. the measured redshift. The 1σ error in the fitted redshift value is given in the upper left corner of the residual plot in d). Figure 21 shows the estimated redshifts for all of the galaxies used in this calculation vs. their spectroscopically measured redshifts. This figure is the combination of panel c) from each of the preceding figures. The coefficients for the fit in each subsample in addition to the standard deviation between the fit and the data are listed in Table 3. These results were then applied to the galaxies hosting compact nuclei to estimate redshifts for those without spectroscopic information.

This technique relies on the same principles as the photometric redshift techniques using multicolor information. Connolly et al. (1995) found that a galaxy’s position in multicolor space is a function of redshift, luminosity and spectral type. With accurate photometry in U,B,R and I, they have been able to predict redshifts with $\sigma_z \sim 0.05$. Because of our lack of color information, the typical error in determining redshifts using this technique is $\sigma_z \sim 0.1$. For the purposes of this study, errors of this size are acceptable in determining the space density of compact nuclei. The redshift errors can be incorporated later in the determination of luminosity functions for these objects (see Paper II).

Table 4 is the resulting redshift list for the 101 compact nuclei galaxies in our sample. The 29 galaxies with spectroscopic redshifts obtained at the 4 meter are indicated with a star (*). The error in the spectroscopic redshift is estimated from the formal error of the cross-correlation template fit and the error in the fit to identified lines in the comparison spectrum which was used to determine the dispersion solution. Redshifts from the HDF and Groth strip are reported from the literature and are indicated in the table. For the 66 photometrically estimated galaxies, the error in the reported redshift is based upon the standard deviation of the points in the fit and the error in determining the galaxy magnitude and color. The RA and DEC in J2000 are also given in this table for each object.

Four of the estimated redshifts (6%) yielded negative values or values less than $z=0.1$. Spectroscopic measurements indicate that objects with redshifts less than $z=0.1$ are intrinsically rare in this survey. Therefore, we assume our estimated redshifts to be in error. Each of the four galaxies have very blue colors ($V-I \lesssim 0.2$) which caused the redshift to be estimated too low. To achieve a more realistic estimate of the redshift for these galaxies, we determine the average redshift of galaxies within ± 0.5 magnitude of the galaxy in question. In this way, we use only magnitude information and no color information in the determination. The standard deviation of the average provides the new error estimate for

the redshift which is $\sigma_z \simeq 0.2$. This error is rather large but applies to only a small portion of the sample galaxies.

Figure 22 is a histogram of the redshifts for the compact nuclei galaxies. The solid line represents all 101 galaxies with spectroscopic or photometric redshifts. The hatched region is the histogram of only the 35 galaxies with spectroscopic redshifts. There is clearly some peakiness which appears in the spectroscopic as well as the total redshift distribution. The distribution peaks near $z \sim 0.4$ and extends to $z = 1.0$. However, only those redshifts estimated at $z \leq 0.8$ are considered reliable since very few points beyond $z = 0.8$ were used in the empirical fit for the redshift estimation technique.

12. Summary

The purpose of this study is to understand the space density and properties of active galaxies to $z \simeq 0.8$ through morphological identification of nuclear activity. In this first paper of two, we describe the procedure for selecting Hubble Space Telescope fields and modeling the light profiles of galaxies found in these images. We select galaxies from this survey which require an additional nuclear point source component to adequately model the galaxy light profile. Monte Carlo simulations using real and simulated data allow us to determine the criterion for a unique galaxy model. A total of 1033 galaxies from 70 WFPC2 fields have been modeled in this study where $16 \pm 3\%$ of the galaxies contain an unresolved nuclear component $\geq 3\%$ of the total galaxy light. We find $9 \pm 1\%$ of galaxies contain nuclei $\geq 5\%$ of the galaxy light. These percentages have been corrected for incompleteness effects in our survey.

To determine the space density of these galaxies, it is necessary to obtain redshift information for the selected galaxies in our study. Spectroscopic redshifts have been

obtained for 35 of our AGN/starburst candidates and photometric redshifts are estimated to an accuracy of $\sigma_z \simeq 0.1$ for the remaining sample. We have presented the ground-based spectroscopy for these galaxies as well as the photometric redshift predictions for those galaxies without spectra.

In Paper II, we focus on the analysis of the data presented here. We investigate the properties of the host galaxies and nuclei themselves such as colors, magnitudes, sizes, and Hubble types. We compare these properties with those of local Seyferts and starburst galaxies. The colors of the nuclei are used to differentiate between Seyfert-like nuclei and young starburst nuclei based on colors from representative spectra of these objects. Based on this color selection, we present the upper limit luminosity function for Low-Luminosity AGN (LLAGN) in the magnitude range $-20 \leq M_B \leq -14$ in two redshift bins out to $z=0.8$ and compare it with the LFs of local Seyferts and moderate redshift QSOs. We also comment on the likely contribution of these nuclei to the soft X-ray background.

We would like to thank the referee and editor for comments and suggestions which have improved the quality of this paper. The authors would like to thank John Huchra and Rogier Windhorst for helpful discussions and guidance on this project. We would also like to thank Eric Ostrander who provided us with processed HST images through the MDS pipeline and aided in selection of MDS fields for this project. In addition, we thank Judy Cohen for providing the redshift list from her study of the Hubble Deep Field. This work is based on observations taken with the NASA/ESA *Hubble Space Telescope*, obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute, operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc. This work was supported in part by STScI grant GO-02684.06-87A to R. F. G. for the Medium Deep Survey project.

REFERENCES

- Boroson, T. 1981, ApJS, 46, 177
- Cohen, J. G., Cowie, L. L., Hogg, D. W., Songaila, A., Blandford, R., Hu, E. M. & Shopbell, P. 1996, ApJ, 471L, 5
- Connolly, A. J., Csabai, I., Szalay, A. S., Koo, D. C., Kron, R. G. & Munn, J. A. 1995, AJ, 110, 2655
- Cheng, F. Z., Danese, L., De Zotti, G. & Franchesini, A. 1985, MNRAS, 212, 857
- DeVeney, J., Massey, P. & Sarajedini, V. 1994, ‘Multi-Slits at Kitt Peak: A Manual for Designing and Using Entrance Masks for Low/Moderate-Resolution Spectroscopy’, Kitt Peak National Observatory
- Elvis, M., Soltan A. & Keel, W. C. 1984, ApJ 283, 479
- Griffiths, R. E. et al. 1994, ApJ 437, 67
- Groth E. et al. 1998, in preparation
- Huchra, J. & Burg, R. 1992, ApJ, 393, 90
- Im, M., Griffiths, R. E., Ratnatunga, K. U. & Sarajedini, V. L. 1996, ApJ, 461L, 79
- Kennicutt, R. C. 1992, ApJS, 79, 255
- Kormendy, J. 1977, ApJ, 217, 406
- Koo, D. C. 1986, in Structure and Evolution of Galactic Nuclei, eds. G. Guiricin et al., p. 317
- Koo, D. C. et al. 1996, ApJ, 469, 535
- Koratkar, A., Deustua, S. E., Heckman, T., Filippenko, A. V., Ho, L. C. & Rao, M. 1995, ApJ 440, 132

- Lauer, T. R., Ajhar, E. A., Byun, Y.-I., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Gillmair, C., Kormendy, J., Richstone, D. & Tremaine, S. 1995, *AJ*, 110, 2622
- Nelson, C. H., MacKenty, J. W., Simkin, S. M. & Griffiths, R. E. 1996, *ApJ*, 466, 713
- McArthur, B., Jefferys, W. & McCartney, J. 1994, *BAAS*, 18, 2804
- Maiolino, R. & Rieke, G. H. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 95
- Markarian, B. E., Lipovetskii, V. A. & Stepanian, D. A. 1981, *Astrofizika*, 17, 619
- Massey, P., DeVeney, J., Jannuzi, B., & Carder, E. 1997, ‘Low-to-Moderate Resolution Optical Spectroscopy Manual for Kitt Peak’, Kitt Peak National Observatory
- Mutz, S. B. et al. 1994, *ApJL* 434, L55
- Ratnatunga, K. U., Griffiths, R. E. & Ostrander E. J. 1998, *ApJ*, in preparation
- Ratnatunga, K. U., Griffiths, R. E., Casertano, S., Neuschaefer, L. W. & Wyckoff, E. W. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 2362
- Ratnatunga, K. U. & Casertano, S. 1991, *AJ*, 101, 1075
- Salzer, J. J., Macalpine, G. M. & Boroson, T. A. 1989, *ApJS*, 70, 479
- Salzer, J. J., Moody, J. W., Rosenberg, J. L., Gregory, S. A. & Newberry, M. V. 1995, *AJ*, 109, 2376
- Sarajedini, V. L., Green, R. F., Griffiths, R. E. & Ratnatunga, K. U. 1998, submitted (Paper II)
- Schade, D., Lilly, S. J., Crampton, D., Hammer, F., LeFevre, O., Tresse, L. 1995, *ApJ*, 451, L1
- Schmidt, M. & Green, R. F. 1986, *ApJ*, 305, 68
- Stoeck, J. T., Morris, S. L., Gioia, I. M., Maccacaro, T., Schild, R., Wolter, A., Fleming, T. A. & Henry, J. P. 1991, *ApJS*, 76, 813

Veilleux, S. & Osterbrock, D. E. 1987, ApJS, 63, 295

Weedman, D. W., Feldman, F. R., Balzano, V. A., Ramsey, L. W., Sramek, R. A. & Wu,
C.-C. 1981, ApJ, 248, 105

Williams, R. E. 1996, AJ, 112, 1335

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1.— The diameter of an unresolved region in a WFPC2 image as a function of the object’s redshift. The lines represent values of $H_o = 50, 75, \text{ and } 100 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$.

Fig. 2.— Output from the 2-dimensional modeling software. From left to right the boxes are: 1) the observed 64×64 pixel area around the galaxy, 2) the selected region for analysis, 3) the PSF convolved maximum likelihood model image, 4) the maximum likelihood model image, 5) the residual image (model subtracted from real image), 6) the sigma image, 7) the object mask image.

Fig. 3.— Parameters of galaxies used in the Monte-Carlo simulation. The galaxies cover a range of Bulge-to-Total luminosity ratios, magnitudes and SNRIL values. SNRIL is the integrated signal-to-noise measurement described in the text.

Fig. 4.— The input vs. the measured magnitude for the point source nuclei detected in the Monte-Carlo simulation.

Fig. 5.— The input vs. the measured magnitude for the point source nuclei detected in the Monte-Carlo simulation after applying the selection criteria outlined in the text.

Fig. 6.— The histogram of $\text{mag}_{obs} - \text{mag}_{real}$ for point sources at 23 ± 0.25 . The dotted line represents the gaussian curve with $\sigma=0.26$. b) Same histogram for point sources at 24 ± 0.25 magnitudes. The gaussian represents $\sigma=0.56$.

Fig. 7.— a) The Bulge-to-Bulge+Disk measured in galaxies within which point source nuclei were detected in the simulations vs. the input Bulge-to-Bulge+Disk for the host galaxy. b) The measured Bulge-to-Bulge+Disk as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio for galaxies in the simulations in which point source nuclei were detected. Note that nuclear point source detections greater than 20% of the total galaxy light are associated with

galaxies having no detected bulge ($(B/B+D) = 0$).

Fig. 8.— a) The histogram of galaxies in the simulation containing no bulge component as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio. The solid line represents all galaxies in the simulation with no bulge component and the hatched region represents those galaxies in which the nuclear point source was detected. b) The fractional completeness or success rate in detecting point source nuclei in galaxies containing no bulge component. The errorbars are the Poisson statistics based on the number of objects in each bin.

Fig. 9.— a) The histogram of galaxies in the simulation containing bulge components with $0 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.4$ as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio. The hatched region represents those in which the point source nucleus was detected. The panel to the right is the fractional completeness or success rate in detecting point source nuclei for these galaxies. b) Same as above except for galaxies with $0.4 < (B/B+D) \leq 0.8$. c) Same as above except for galaxies with $0.8 < (B/B+D) \leq 1.0$.

Fig. 10.— a) The histogram of all galaxies in the simulation containing no bulge component as a function of the SNRIL value. The hatched region represents those galaxies where a 2-component point source+disk model was the best fit thereby detecting the point source nucleus. b) The histogram of all galaxies in the simulation containing some bulge component as a function of the SNRIL value. The hatched region represents those galaxies where a 2-component point source+disk model or a 3-component point source+disk+bulge model was the best fit. The cross-hatched region represents those galaxies where the 3-component model was the best fit.

Fig. 11.— I band image of galaxies containing unresolved nuclear point sources down to 1% of the total galaxies light. The galaxies are arranged in descending order from the greatest point source-to-total luminosity ratio from left to right, top to bottom. The ID number is

used to indentify each object throughout the paper.

Fig. 12.— The point source nucleus magnitude vs. the integrated galaxy magnitude in a) I and b) V. The dashed line represents the locus where the point source is 1% of the total galaxy light.

Fig. 13.— The overall completeness estimate for detecting nuclei in the survey galaxies as a function of the point source-to-total luminosity ratio.

Fig. 14.— a) The fraction of total survey galaxies containing unresolved nuclei as a function of the limiting point source-to-total luminosity ratio. The dashed line represents this fraction after correcting for completeness according to Figure 2.15. b) The completeness adjustment factor as a function of the limiting point source-to-total luminosity ratio. This is the amount by which the fraction must be multiplied to correct for incompleteness.

Fig. 15.— Spectra of galaxies containing compact nuclei obtained at the Kitt Peak 4-meter telescope. The spectra are not flux calibrated and are in units of flux (electrons) vs. wavelength (angstroms). Prominent emission and absorption features are indicated. The object name and redshift is in the upper left corner and an ID number corresponding to the ID number for the galaxy image in Figure 2.13 is in the upper right corner. The dashed line is the arbitrarily scaled error spectrum.

Fig. 16.— a) The I magnitude for galaxies in our survey vs. the measured redshift. b) The V-I color vs. the redshift. c) The Bulge/Total luminosity ratio vs. the redshift.

Fig. 17.— a) The I magnitude for galaxies in our survey with $\text{Bulge/Total} \leq 0.2$ vs. the measured redshift. b) The V-I color vs. the redshift. c) The estimated redshift based on fits to the color and magnitude vs. the true redshift. d) The residual of the fit ($z_{\text{measured}} - z_{\text{est}}$) vs. the measured redshift. The standard deviation of the fit is indicated.

Fig. 18.— a) The I magnitude for galaxies in our survey with $\text{Bulge/Total} \leq 0.5$ vs. the measured redshift. b) The V-I color vs. the redshift. c) The estimated redshift based on fits to the color and magnitude vs. the true redshift. d) The residual of the fit ($z_{\text{measured}} - z_{\text{est}}$) vs. the measured redshift. The standard deviation of the fit is indicated.

Fig. 19.— a) The I magnitude for galaxies in our survey with $\text{Bulge/Total} > 0.5$ vs. the measured redshift. b) The V-I color vs. the redshift. c) The estimated redshift based on fits to the color and magnitude vs. the true redshift. d) The residual of the fit ($z_{\text{measured}} - z_{\text{est}}$) vs. the measured redshift. The standard deviation of the fit is indicated.

Fig. 20.— a) The I magnitude for galaxies in our survey with $\text{Bulge/Total} > 0.8$ vs. the measured redshift. b) The V-I color vs. the redshift. c) The estimated redshift based on fits to the color and magnitude vs. the true redshift. d) The residual of the fit ($z_{\text{measured}} - z_{\text{est}}$) vs. the measured redshift. The standard deviation of the fit is indicated.

Fig. 21.— The photometric redshift vs. the measured spectroscopic redshift for those galaxies used in the empirical fit.

Fig. 22.— The histogram of redshifts for the compact nuclei galaxies. The hatched region represents those galaxies where the redshift was determined spectroscopically.

Table 1. MDS Fields

Field Name	RA(J2000)	DEC(J2000)	b	V _#	V _{exp} (s)	I _#	I _{exp} (s)	V _{lim}	I _{lim}	# _{gal}
uad01	0 15 47.8	-16 19 04.9	-76.40	2	1200	2	2000	20.1	20.7	4
uad00	0 15 55.4	-16 18 06.2	-76.40	2	1200	2	2000	21.1	20.1	3
ua400	0 24 53.6	-27 16 23.4	-84.10	4	8000	4	8000	22.6	21.9	24
ubz01	0 50 32.5	-52 07 25.3	-65.00	2	1200	2	2000	21.2	20.8	8
ueh00	0 53 23.2	12 33 57.7	-50.30	3	5400	3	6300	21.6	21.0	15
ueh02	0 53 36.6	12 49 49.4	-50.04	2	3300	2	4200	22.2	21.3	23
ua-30	0 58 06.8	-28 11 40.7	-88.18	3	3900	5	4900	22.5	22.0	19
ua-00	1 02 26.5	-27 11 52.8	-87.55	2	2100	2	4200	21.7	21.5	27
ua-01	1 04 36.0	-27 5 17.1	-87.07	3	8700	4	10700	22.8	22.0	22
ujh01	1 09 03.5	35 36 25.2	-27.13	1	1200	2	4200	21.3	21.2	10
ubi01	1 09 59.8	-2 27 23.8	-64.93	2	3300	3	6300	21.5	21.0	20
ubi00	1 10 03.0	-2 26 22.8	-64.91	1	1200	2	4200	20.8	20.8	6
uci10	1 24 42.4	3 51 27.6	-57.99	3	4800	4	10800	22.2	21.9	18
ufj00	2 07 05.8	15 25 18.3	-43.66	1	1200	2	4200	21.4	21.4	23
ugk00	2 38 51.6	16 44 38.2	-38.97	1	2700	2	5400	21.4	21.0	8
udm00	2 42 39.5	0 48 49.3	-51.32	1	1200	2	3000	22.1	21.1	3
udm10	2 42 51.7	0 04 25.0	-51.95	4	4000	3	5400	21.8	21.6	14a
ucs01	2 56 22.0	-33 22 25.4	-62.42	2	1500	2	4200	21.5	21.2	13
uem00	3 05 03.2	0 11 13.1	-48.11	2	2400	5	6600	21.8	21.4	14
uim01	3 55 31.4	9 43 32.0	-32.15	6	3600	10	6600	21.5	21.0	14
uko01	4 56 45.5	3 52 40.8	-23.28	1	1200	2	4200	21.4	21.3	12
uqk11	7 24 46.6	60 31 02.3	27.41	1	1000	5	3100	21.3	21.1	16
uop00	7 50 47.1	14 40 44.2	19.63	5	7200	2	4200	22.0	21.3	9
urp03	8 47 21.5	17 57 29.8	33.42	1	1200	2	3000	21.4	20.8	12
urp01	8 47 24.1	17 56 22.9	33.42	1	600	1	2400	20.4	21.1	8
usp00	8 54 16.1	20 03 41.9	35.68	2	3300	2	4200	21.8	21.2	8
ust01	10 05 16.9	-7 47 35.1	36.74	1	1200	3	2380	21.6	20.4	8
ust00	10 05 46.3	-7 41 30.3	36.90	10	16500	11	23100	23.1	22.2	17

Table 1—Continued

Field Name	RA(J2000)	DEC(J2000)	b	V _#	V _{exp} (s)	I _#	I _{exp} (s)	V _{lim}	I _{lim}	# _{gal}
uui00	11 42 04.7	71 37 43.9	44.47	3	5400	3	6300	22.5	21.6	32
uzp01	11 50 29.8	28 48 29.6	76.45	2	3300	3	6300	22.0	21.7	22
uyj00	11 53 25.2	49 31 12.9	64.98	1	300	3	2700	20.2	21.0	15
uzk02	12 11 13.1	39 26 56.0	75.11	1	600	3	7200	21.2	21.8	17
uzx00	12 30 16.5	12 21 47.3	74.42	3	4500	1	2100	22.2	20.9	22
uzx07	12 30 51.0	12 19 03.0	74.42	4	5200	3	2700	22.1	20.5	8
uzx01	12 30 54.2	12 19 05.6	74.43	5	3480	4	6200	22.0	21.4	8
uxy00	12 32 31.6	-2 21 48.6	60.16	1	1200	2	4200	21.7	21.4	11
uxy10	12 36 38.9	0 41 54.9	61.95	3	980	5	3780	21.0	21.1	7
HDF	12 36 49.4	62 12 58.0	54.83	103	1051	58	2137	24.2	23.5	106
uzy00	12 38 14.1	11 52 30.6	74.44	1	1200	2	2700	21.2	20.7	4
uzy01	12 38 15.8	11 51 18.2	74.42	2	3000	2	2700	21.9	20.7	4
uwy02	12 40 22.8	-11 31 29.7	51.25	6	11700	5	9600	23.0	22.1	21
urz00	12 53 01.9	-29 14 21.4	33.63	3	5400	4	8400	22.3	22.2	24
uz-00	13 00 23.6	28 20 13.2	87.68	2	1200	2	2000	21.3	20.8	4
uzd10	13 55 18.3	40 20 30.6	71.33	1	3500	2	6100	22.1	21.5	21
uy000	14 16 18.1	11 32 22.7	64.70	4	6000	4	6900	22.3	21.6	16
u26x9	14 17 23.7	52 25 13.0	59.77	4	700	4	1000	22.0	21.6	21
u26x8	14 17 30.2	52 26 22.8	59.79	4	700	4	1000	21.9	21.4	22
u26x7	14 17 36.8	52 27 32.7	59.82	4	700	4	1000	21.8	21.3	16
u26x6	14 17 49.9	52 29 52.3	59.87	4	700	4	1000	22.1	21.4	12
u26x5	14 17 56.4	52 31 02.1	59.89	4	700	4	1000	22.0	21.2	13
uy400	14 34 57.8	25 11 45.4	66.73	6	5200	6	6000	22.1	21.5	8
uy402	14 35 16.9	24 59 04.0	66.62	2	1400	3	5400	21.5	21.5	2
uy401	14 35 33.1	25 18 15.9	66.62	4	2400	8	8000	21.9	21.9	15
ux400	15 19 41.2	23 52 05.5	56.51	2	3300	4	7500	21.9	21.6	24
ux401	15 19 55.0	23 44 46.0	56.43	2	3300	3	6000	21.9	21.5	11
uvd01	15 43 23.7	53 52 46.4	48.77	3	9000	2	6000	23.0	21.8	18

Table 1—Continued

Field Name	RA(J2000)	DEC(J2000)	b	V _#	V _{exp} (s)	I _#	I _{exp} (s)	V _{lim}	I _{lim}	# _{gal}
ut201	16 01 12.3	5 36 02.8	40.06	6	3600	12	12000	22.2	21.8	21
ut200	16 01 27.4	5 23 55.6	39.90	6	5200	6	6000	22.3	21.7	15
usa02	17 12 23.2	33 35 49.3	34.25	3	5400	3	6300	22.6	21.7	9
usa01	17 12 23.9	33 36 03.9	34.25	3	5400	3	6300	22.4	21.8	7
usa00	17 12 24.6	33 36 15.8	34.25	3	5400	3	6300	22.7	21.9	11
uqa02	17 36 22.5	28 00 58.7	27.84	2	1200	2	2000	21.3	21.2	3
uqa01	17 36 38.6	28 04 08.8	27.80	2	1200	4	2280	21.3	20.7	4
uj000	19 39 22.9	-46 13 46.2	-27.20	1	1200	2	4500	21.2	21.4	11
uj700	19 40 40.2	-69 16 01.8	-29.58	3	5400	3	6300	22.1	21.6	9
umd08	21 50 34.9	28 49 41.6	-19.23	4	1200	1	2400	21.4	21.0	12
umd09	21 50 38.5	28 55 56.5	-19.16	2	2400	2	4200	22.0	21.2	12
umd05	21 51 07.2	29 00 00.5	-19.18	1	1200	2	3900	21.5	21.5	6
umd0a	21 51 13.1	29 00 04.6	-19.20	2	3300	3	8700	22.1	22.0	22
uec00	23 04 28.6	3 04 38.2	-50.28	1	1200	2	3000	21.4	21.1	9

Note. — Column 1 - MDS Field name, Columns 2 & 3 - J2000 coordinates, Column 4 - galactic latitude, Column 5 - # of V exposures, Column 6 - total V exposure time, Column 7 - # of I exposures, Column 8 - total I exposure time, Columns 9 & 10 - the limiting V and I integrated galaxy magnitude for fitting galaxies with a 3-component model, Column 11 - the number of galaxies in the I image above this limiting magnitude. Additional information on MDS fields can be obtained at <http://archive.stsci.edu/mds/mds.cgi>.

Table 2. Model Parameters for Galaxies Containing Unresolved Nuclei

ID#	Name	I_{mag}	σ_I	hlr	σ_{hlr}	V-I	σ_{V-I}	B/ T_I	P/ T_I	P/ T_V	V- I_P	σ_{V-I}
1	ua400-7	20.530	0.008	-0.767	0.020	0.602	0.011	0.000	0.485	0.687	0.224	0.333
2	uwy02-4	19.041	0.003	-0.367	0.006	1.071	0.004	0.000	0.414	0.489	0.890	0.285
3	ua-30-13	21.249	0.012	-1.016	0.024	0.810	0.016	0.000	0.333	0.410	0.584	0.436
4	ust01-11	19.760	0.017	-0.937	0.039	0.867	0.021	1.000	0.000	0.293	...	...
5	u26x9-20	21.231	0.011	-1.049	0.019	1.995	0.035	0.000	0.285	0.262	2.086	0.555
6	uy401-12	20.390	0.007	-0.605	0.013	0.980	0.017	0.000	0.276	0.214	1.256	0.413
7	ut200-28	20.897	0.017	-0.687	0.026	1.416	0.039	0.000	0.264	0.256	1.449	0.478
8	ufj00-13	19.841	0.006	-0.857	0.012	1.047	0.013	0.000	0.264	0.230	1.197	0.371
9	udm10-24	21.646	0.033	-1.254	0.043	1.275	0.059	0.000	0.250	0.366	0.861	0.528
10	umd0a-47	20.912	0.008	-1.013	0.014	1.709	0.040	0.000	0.190	0.165	1.862	0.549
11	ua400-26	21.448	0.013	-0.534	0.020	1.754	0.028	0.000	0.184	0.000	...	...
12	uvd01-26	21.157	0.012	-0.522	0.020	1.368	0.018	0.000	0.183	0.162	1.500	0.550
13	ua-01-10	21.153	0.011	-0.731	0.014	1.502	0.024	0.000	0.175	0.187	1.430	0.550
14	uzx01-37	21.190	0.021	-0.890	0.032	1.209	0.051	0.000	0.173	0.279	0.690	0.511
15	ut201-18	20.827	0.009	-0.763	0.014	1.351	0.026	0.000	0.169	0.241	0.966	0.489
16	uvd01-14	20.221	0.009	-0.505	0.012	1.169	0.013	0.000	0.167	0.130	1.441	0.458
17	uzx00-3	18.912	0.083	-0.498	0.084	1.257	0.084	0.291	0.160	0.089	1.894	0.402
18	usa00-35	22.319	0.020	-1.084	0.030	0.416	0.024	0.000	0.154	0.202	0.121	0.623
19	ueh02-14	20.715	0.034	-0.244	0.037	-0.246	0.358	0.000	0.144	0.000	...	...
20	umd0a-25	19.717	0.012	-0.593	0.023	1.286	0.014	0.335	0.141	0.178	1.033	0.410
21	uui00-31	21.469	0.028	-0.789	0.036	0.844	0.030	0.317	0.133	0.055	1.803	0.669
22	u26x6-11	21.311	0.015	-0.978	0.025	2.144	0.056	0.000	0.124	0.139	2.020	0.676
23	usa00-9	19.364	0.004	-0.502	0.000	1.007	0.006	0.150	0.118	0.117	1.016	0.392
24	uzp01-19	20.859	0.016	-0.305	0.017	1.169	0.036	0.000	0.117	0.112	1.216	0.554
25	umd05-46	20.913	0.028	-0.283	0.029	0.684	0.189	0.000	0.116	0.035	1.985	0.674
26	ueh02-4	19.720	0.014	-0.087	0.015	0.336	0.095	0.000	0.115	0.000	...	...
27	uy401-4	18.498	0.008	0.512	0.011	1.194	0.021	0.463	0.094	0.077	1.411	0.366
28	uj700-29	20.014	0.036	0.219	0.030	1.240	0.059	0.152	0.000	0.087	...	...
29	uvd01-12	20.014	0.007	-0.414	0.009	1.119	0.009	0.026	0.086	0.088	1.094	0.488
30	uzp01-24	21.422	0.017	-0.850	0.021	0.949	0.032	0.000	0.086	0.084	0.975	0.652
31	umd05-37	21.016	0.015	-0.793	0.020	0.742	0.029	0.000	0.082	0.094	0.594	0.579
32	u26x5-6	20.819	0.014	-0.822	0.018	0.941	0.020	0.000	0.080	0.065	1.166	0.596
33	uy400-16	21.172	0.031	0.021	0.028	1.455	0.062	0.000	0.078	0.056	1.815	0.703
34	ust00-8	19.541	0.014	-0.679	0.018	1.173	0.021	0.627	0.074	0.070	1.233	0.467
35	uzx00-4	18.827	0.026	0.580	0.021	1.177	0.028	0.079	0.074	0.046	1.693	0.432

Table 2—Continued

ID#	Name	I_{mag}	σ_I	hlr	σ_{hlr}	V-I	σ_{V-I}	B/ T_I	P/ T_I	P/ T_V	V- I_P	σ_{V-I}
36	uzx00-20	20.454	0.016	-0.665	0.018	0.931	0.019	0.000	0.073	0.057	1.200	0.564
37	u26x7-18	21.325	0.017	-0.904	0.022	1.256	0.034	0.035	0.069	0.093	0.932	0.666
38	u26x8-23	21.384	0.015	-0.914	0.020	1.187	0.023	0.000	0.067	0.097	0.785	0.669
39	uzd10-6	19.236	0.011	0.362	0.011	1.004	0.017	0.360	0.067	0.038	1.620	0.471
40	u26x9-25	21.598	0.028	-0.877	0.032	1.353	0.055	0.000	0.059	0.000	...	...
41	u26x6-9	21.118	0.018	-1.052	0.022	0.951	0.026	0.123	0.059	0.053	1.067	0.674
42	ust00-27	21.157	0.008	-0.584	0.009	1.430	0.019	0.129	0.058	0.064	1.323	0.701
43	uhdfk-106	22.976	0.009	-1.739	0.015	1.954	0.023	0.091	0.056	0.055	1.974	1.113
44	umd09-4	17.900	0.006	0.591	0.005	0.963	0.012	0.000	0.056	0.044	1.225	0.354
45	urp03-14	20.770	0.024	-0.153	0.025	0.608	0.038	0.000	0.056	0.055	0.628	0.614
46	uxy10-6	20.276	0.010	-1.083	0.010	0.753	0.019	0.173	0.000	0.052	...	...
47	uui00-17	20.335	0.014	0.145	0.017	1.270	0.024	0.167	0.050	0.043	1.434	0.623
48	uci10-11	20.551	0.011	0.108	0.010	0.751	0.018	0.000	0.049	0.046	0.820	0.601
49	uhdfk-36	21.484	0.004	-0.846	0.005	0.950	0.006	0.000	0.049	0.000	...	...
50	u26x8-31	21.355	0.034	-0.461	0.031	1.219	0.069	0.000	0.049	0.067	0.879	0.721
51	ufj00-17	20.477	0.011	-0.539	0.013	0.607	0.019	0.000	0.048	0.038	0.861	0.604
52	u26x7-10	20.519	0.016	-0.496	0.016	1.224	0.048	0.000	0.045	0.035	1.497	0.665
53	uzk02-5	20.630	0.008	-0.742	0.012	0.435	0.022	0.000	0.043	0.000	...	...
54	usa02-34	21.318	0.021	-0.751	0.023	0.776	0.026	0.173	0.042	0.067	0.269	0.689
55	uui00-11	20.176	0.008	-0.617	0.009	0.588	0.009	0.000	0.041	0.044	0.511	0.558
56	uim01-9	19.678	0.024	0.213	0.017	0.637	0.059	0.000	0.039	0.020	1.362	0.568
57	uhdfk-68	22.465	0.010	-0.936	0.013	1.418	0.021	0.000	0.039	0.043	1.312	0.978
58	ua-01-9	20.852	0.016	-0.860	0.021	1.242	0.086	0.400	0.000	0.037	...	...
59	usp00-10	21.198	0.016	-0.266	0.000	0.637	0.035	0.123	0.000	0.036	...	...
60	uhdfk-32	21.315	0.004	-0.922	0.006	0.457	0.014	0.247	0.034	0.000	...	...
61	u26x7-7	20.685	0.017	-0.685	0.020	0.653	0.021	0.279	0.033	0.038	0.500	0.657
62	umd0a-63	21.437	0.028	-0.711	0.033	0.398	0.056	0.158	0.032	0.017	1.085	0.829
63	uhdfk-17	20.409	0.003	-0.363	0.003	1.181	0.006	0.000	0.031	0.000	...	...
64	usp00-3	19.001	0.008	0.344	0.005	1.022	0.017	0.027	0.031	0.024	1.300	0.513
65	uqk11-6	19.203	0.052	0.386	0.102	1.628	0.120	0.933	0.031	0.045	1.223	0.557
66	ut201-37	21.348	0.014	-0.739	0.016	0.903	0.030	0.000	0.030	0.019	1.399	0.875
67	uhdfk-63	22.603	0.007	-1.628	0.010	0.611	0.009	0.000	0.028	0.035	0.369	0.974
68	ua-30-20	21.381	0.027	-0.759	0.028	0.909	0.045	0.000	0.027	0.032	0.725	0.814
69	ugk00-1	18.206	0.008	0.572	0.006	0.762	0.017	0.000	0.026	0.017	1.223	0.444
70	u26x9-8	20.217	0.023	0.043	0.019	0.751	0.061	0.000	0.025	0.000	...	...

Table 2—Continued

ID#	Name	I_{mag}	σ_I	hlr	σ_{hlr}	V-I	σ_{V-I}	B/ T_I	P/ T_I	P/ T_V	V- I_P	σ_{V-I}
71	u26x8-7	18.880	0.011	0.279	0.008	0.820	0.017	0.000	0.025	0.000	...	...
72	ust01-7	19.280	0.017	-0.068	0.016	0.906	0.030	0.000	0.024	0.000	...	...
73	uj000-28	20.111	0.019	-0.109	0.018	0.303	0.049	0.000	0.023	0.000	...	...
74	u26x7-14	20.417	0.042	0.500	0.027	0.652	0.166	0.000	0.022	0.000	...	...
75	uhdfk-46	22.199	0.007	-1.351	0.007	0.650	0.009	0.000	0.021	0.024	0.505	0.969
76	usa01-34	21.149	0.008	-1.360	0.013	1.033	0.012	0.000	0.020	0.057	-0.104	0.799
77	ut201-33	21.118	0.033	-0.216	0.029	0.829	0.093	0.000	0.020	0.016	1.071	0.875
78	uy400-15	21.469	0.017	-1.178	0.018	1.372	0.038	0.148	0.019	0.054	0.238	0.884
79	uy000-14	19.829	0.035	-0.174	0.042	1.415	0.040	0.597	0.019	0.020	1.359	0.699
80	ua400-8	19.913	0.008	-0.054	0.008	0.833	0.012	0.000	0.018	0.011	1.368	0.711
81	urp03-8	19.488	0.006	0.293	0.007	0.766	0.031	0.191	0.000	0.018	...	...
82	uqa01-21	19.183	0.008	-0.818	0.008	0.846	0.014	0.000	0.018	0.012	1.286	0.608
83	uj000-20	20.034	0.190	0.184	0.097	0.048	0.190	0.000	0.017	0.000	...	...
84	usa00-5	18.945	0.007	0.259	0.006	0.569	0.009	0.000	0.016	0.014	0.714	0.544
85	ust00-23	20.667	0.030	0.136	0.020	1.755	0.042	0.000	0.016	0.000	...	...
86	ujh01-2	18.329	0.005	-0.088	0.006	0.790	0.010	0.002	0.016	0.011	1.197	0.556
87	u26x6-6	21.076	0.041	-0.690	0.033	-0.026	0.042	0.000	0.016	0.000	...	...
88	ux400-7	18.932	0.003	-0.203	0.004	0.763	0.006	0.000	0.016	0.000	...	...
89	uko01-25	20.378	0.036	0.040	0.028	0.617	0.155	0.000	0.016	0.039	-0.350	0.695
90	ueh00-2	18.065	0.016	0.565	0.010	0.719	0.023	0.000	0.016	0.011	1.126	0.476
91	u26x8-5	19.000	0.010	0.1209	0.008	0.716	0.016	0.000	0.015	0.000	...	...
92	urz00-8	19.401	0.005	-0.087	0.005	0.853	0.007	0.030	0.015	0.016	0.783	0.620
93	uem00-4	18.695	0.011	0.490	0.008	1.177	0.022	0.000	0.015	0.012	1.419	0.580
94	uwy02-5	19.135	0.010	-0.050	0.011	0.686	0.010	0.199	0.015	0.000	...	...
95	uzx07-4	18.955	0.025	0.488	0.022	0.703	0.028	0.047	0.000	0.013	...	...
96	uhdfk-27	20.972	0.004	-0.049	0.005	1.015	0.004	0.000	0.013	0.017	0.724	0.872
97	u26x8-12	20.219	0.031	0.155	0.020	1.223	0.078	0.000	0.013	0.000	...	...
98	uui00-3	18.417	0.005	0.076	0.005	0.812	0.006	0.012	0.012	0.027	-0.068	0.477
99	umd08-13	18.085	0.004	0.222	0.001	0.620	0.018	0.059	0.000	0.012	...	...
100	usa02-6	18.658	0.016	0.403	0.015	0.745	0.027	0.204	0.012	0.000	...	...
101	uim01-4	18.603	0.019	0.578	0.020	1.155	0.041	0.530	0.012	0.027	0.275	0.524

Table 3. Redshift Estimation Coefficients

Bulge/Total	σ_z	# of gals	C1 (color)	C2 (mag)	C3 (zero pt.)
≤ 0.20	0.09657	66	0.5154	0.0681	-1.4084
≤ 0.50	0.10043	88	0.4013	0.0761	-1.4901
> 0.50	0.11124	39	0.2768	0.1115	-2.0903
> 0.80	0.10246	22	0.0868	0.1560	-2.6792

Table 4. Redshift List

ID#	Name	RA	DEC	Redshift	σ_z	Comment
1	ua400-7	0 24 53.4	-27 16 43.4	0.9947	0.0003	*
2	uwy02-4	12 40 20.6	-11 32 13.5	0.4556	0.0004	*
3	ua-30-13	0 58 02.7	-28 12 43.2	0.5547	0.0975	
4	ust01-11	10 05 19.2	-7 46 24.8	0.5113	0.1025	
5	u26x9-20	14 17 28.3	52 25 56.7	1.0727	0.0995	
6	uy401-12	14 35 32.1	25 17 38.0	0.4632	0.0970	
7	ut200-28	16 01 08.6	5 12 47.7	0.7611	0.0989	
8	ufj00-13	2 07 06.5	15 25 00.7	0.4798	0.0969	
9	udm10-24	2 42 54.2	-0 04 30.9	0.8381	0.1025	
10	umd0a-47	21 51 14.3	29 01 07.3	0.8951	0.0990	
11	ua400-26	0 24 52.9	-27 16 09.3	0.8575	0.0977	
12	uvd01-26	15 43 22.6	53 52 11.2	0.7382	0.0971	
13	ua-01-10	1 04 40.5	-27 05 43.7	0.8287	0.0974	
14	uzx01-37	12 30 55.3	12 18 34.3	0.7486	0.1006	
15	ut201-18	16 01 08.4	5 35 25.2	0.7706	0.0977	
16	uvd01-14	15 43 20.9	53 51 52.1	0.5603	0.0968	
17	uzx00-3	12 30 14.0	12 22 29.4	0.2474	0.0003	*
18	usa00-35	17 12 25.9	33 36 36.4	0.2549	0.0002	*
19	ueh02-14	0 53 38.0	12 50 20.8	0.5021	0.2084	
20	umd0a-25	21 51 14.6	28 59 55.7	0.3951	0.0003	*
21	uui00-31	11 42 14.9	71 38 16.9	0.4566	0.1013	
22	u26x6-11	14 17 46.0	52 30 32.6	1.1674	0.1012	
23	usa00-9	17 12 29.4	33 36 36.0	0.3235	0.0003	*

Table 4—Continued

ID#	Name	RA	DEC	Redshift	σ_z	Comment
24	uzp01-19	11 50 27.0	28 47 27.4	0.6206	0.0984	
25	umd05-46	21 51 03.1	29 00 16.6	0.3284	0.1373	
26	ueh02-4	0 53 37.9	12 49 48.8	0.3853	0.1575	
27	uy401-4	14 35 29.3	25 19 23.4	0.3938	0.0003	*
28	uj700-29	19 40 33.8	-69 17 13.7	0.6446	0.1013	
29	uvd01-12	15 43 16.3	53 52 35.8	0.4164?	0.0003	*
30	uzp01-24	11 50 29.6	28 47 45.1	0.5450	0.0981	
31	umd05-37	21 51 02.8	28 59 43.8	0.1918	0.0002	*
32	u26x5-6	14 17 47.9	52 30 47.0	0.4915	0.0972	
33	uy400-16	14 35 18.6	24 59 05.9	0.7761	0.1018	
34	ust00-8	10 05 44.5	-7 41 07.2	0.5360	0.0003	*
35	uzzx00-4	12 30 20.9	12 22 47.7	0.2604	0.0002	*
36	uzzx00-20	12 30 20.4	12 21 50.5	0.4604	0.0971	
37	u26x7-18	14 17 42.2	52 26 45.2	0.7111	0.0982	
38	u26x8-23	14 17 35.8	52 25 33.1	0.6830	0.0975	
39	uzd10-6	13 55 23.0	40 20 49.7	0.3691	0.1007	
40	u26x9-25	14 17 23.1	52 25 28.9	0.7302	0.1007	
41	u26x6-9	14 17 46.4	52 30 43.8	0.5208	0.0976	
42	ust00-27	10 05 43.8	-7 42 01.5	0.7774	0.0971	
43	uhdfk-106	12 36 41.4	62 12 16.3	1.1670	0.0978	
44	umd09-4	21 50 40.3	28 56 29.1	0.2488	0.0002	*
45	urp03-14	8 47 23.3	17 57 51.2	0.3231	0.0987	
46	uxy10-6	12 36 37.5	-0 42 58.8	0.3904	0.0971	

Table 4—Continued

ID#	Name	RA	DEC	Redshift	σ_z	Comment
47	uui00-17	11 41 57.1	71 37 30.1	0.5513??	0.0003	*
48	uci10-11	1 24 41.2	3 51 56.6	0.3801	0.0970	
49	uhdfk-36	12 36 49.6	62 12 58.6	0.4750	...	1
50	u26x8-31	14 17 35.1	52 25 41.5	0.6886	0.1030	
51	ufj00-17	2 07 10.4	15 25 37.4	0.2967	0.0971	
52	u26x7-10	14 17 40.6	52 27 13.1	0.6174	0.0997	
53	uzk02-5	12 11 19.0	39 26 27.0	0.1994	0.0973	
54	usa02-34	17 12 28.0	33 35 29.3	0.4613	0.0975	
55	uui00-11	11 42 02.8	71 37 18.5	0.2735	0.0967	
56	uim01-9	3 55 30.1	9 43 44.7	0.2520	0.1013	
57	uhdfk-68	12 36 49.1	62 11 49.6	0.8576	0.0972	
58	ua-01-9	1 04 35.0	-27 04 54.2	0.6116	0.1063	
59	usp00-10	8 54 18.7	20 03 51.4	0.3020?	0.0003	*
60	uhdfk-32	12 36 49.5	62 14 07.7	0.7520	...	1
61	u26x7-7	14 17 37.1	52 27 39.1	0.3511	0.1008	
62	umd0a-63	21 51 17.7	29 00 54.4	0.2504	0.1008	
63	uhdfk-17	12 36 53.8	62 12 54.9	0.6420	...	1
64	usp00-3	8 54 12.4	20 04 15.4	0.4573?	0.0003	*
65	uqk11-6	7 24 48.9	60 31 26.3	0.4964	0.0003	*
66	ut201-37	16 01 14.6	5 34 35.0	0.5067	0.0978	
67	uhdfk-63	12 36 43.3	62 11 52.8	0.4519	0.0967	
68	ua-30-20	0 58 02.9	-28 12 29.0	0.5211	0.0994	
69	ugk00-1	2 38 52.5	16 43 29.3	0.2752	0.0003	*


Table 4—Continued


ID#	Name	RA	DEC	Redshift	σ_z	Comment
70	u26x9-8	14 17 24.6	52 23 57.3	0.3431	0.1015	
71	u26x8-7	14 17 31.1	52 25 24.0	0.2870	...	2
72	ust01-7	10 05 12.2	-7 47 15.8	0.3597	0.0978	
73	uj000-28	19 39 18.3	-46 14 46.8	0.4663	0.1935	
74	u26x7-14	14 17 39.9	52 28 20.8	0.3072	0.1292	
75	uhdfk-46	12 36 45.3	62 13 27.0	0.4416	0.0967	
76	usa01-34	17 12 27.1	33 35 57.6	0.5873	0.0969	
77	ut201-33	16 01 11.3	5 35 32.9	0.4562	0.1079	
78	uy400-15	14 35 16.9	24 59 11.4	0.7825	0.0986	
79	uy000-14	14 16 15.4	11 32 04.6	0.5149	0.1119	
80	ua400-8	0 24 53.9	-27 15 57.5	0.4310	0.0003	*
81	urp03-8	8 47 21.3	17 56 52.7	0.3280	0.0003	*
82	uqa01-21	17 36 41.5	28 04 31.2	0.2528?	0.0003	*
83	uj000-20	19 39 19.9	-46 13 02.8	0.4797	0.1973	
84	usa00-5	17 12 21.3	33 35 56.7	0.2555	0.0002	*
85	ust00-23	10 05 49.2	-7 41 38.5	0.8957	0.0990	
86	ujh01-2	1 09 00.4	35 35 38.9	0.2480	0.0002	*
87	u26x6-6	14 17 47.6	52 29 04.1	0.8098?	...	2
88	ux400-7	15 19 38.9	23 53 02.0	0.2663	0.0966	
89	uko01-25	4 56 49.5	3 52 06.7	0.5929?	0.0003	*
90	ueh00-2	0 53 22.4	12 32 56.0	0.1908	0.0973	
91	u26x8-5	14 17 26.5	52 27 05.7	0.2472	0.0969	
92	urz00-8	12 53 00.6	-29 15 04.3	0.3541	0.0966	







Table 4—Continued


ID#	Name	RA	DEC	Redshift	σ_z	Comment
93	uem00-4	3 04 59.2	-0 11 46.5	0.4775	0.0004	*
94	uwy02-5	12 40 22.6	-11 31 12.5	0.3060	0.0002	*
95	uzx07-4	12 30 47.7	12 19 43.4	0.2681	0.0003	*
96	uhdfk-27	12 36 49.7	62 13 14.0	0.4750	...	1
97	u26x8-12	14 17 34.4	52 25 25.8	0.5925	0.1047	
98	uui00-3	11 42 01.7	71 37 33.1	0.2221	0.0002	*
99	umd08-13	21 50 32.2	28 50 29.4	0.1220	0.0002	*
100	usa02-6	17 12 20.5	33 34 41.4	0.2600	0.0003	*
101	uim01-4	3 55 33.2	9 44 45.6	0.3097	0.1118	


Note. — Comments are as follows: (*)-spectroscopically determined at the KPNO 4-meter; (1)-from Cohen et al. (1996); (2)-from Koo et al. (1996). Additional information on individual objects can be obtained at the MDS website at <http://archive.stsci.edu/mds/mds.cgi>.



































This figure "fig11a.jpeg" is available in "jpeg" format from:



<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9811292v1>


This figure "fig11b.jpeg" is available in "jpeg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9811292v1>


This figure "fig11c.jpeg" is available in "jpeg" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9811292v1>





Fraction of Galaxies containing Point Sources



Completeness Adjustment Factor

